



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 2023

No. 44

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. GREENE of Georgia).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 8, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

KEVIN MCCARTHY,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF JACK VANIER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of a great Kansan, Jack Vanier, who died at the age of 94 last month, as well as his late wife, Donna.

Jack was born in Salina, where he was raised to love agriculture and the conservative Kansas values of faith, hard work, freedom, integrity, family, and personal responsibility. These are

the values that make our State so special, and Jack embodied them. He was an unassuming and humble servant leader with a long list of accomplishments, but he didn't make his life about himself; he made his life about others.

Jack had a larger-than-life personality, but he didn't want the spotlight. He wanted to make a difference in his community, his alma mater K-State, and the lives of the people around him.

Jack was a hero of Kansas agriculture. He painstakingly operated the CK Ranch in Brookville, Kansas, once the largest producer of purebred Hereford cattle in the United States. He brought commonsense leadership to the American Hereford Association, Kansas Livestock Association, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, and Archer-Daniels-Midland.

He was a generous, philanthropic visionary for Kansas State University.

Most importantly, alongside his late wife, Donna, he raised his family on faith.

Jack's wife, Donna, who passed away on May 23, 2020, was larger than life in her own right. Donna was a generous and hardworking philanthropist who always put her family first. She was the driving force behind the Donna L. Vanier Children's Center in Salina, which has now been open for 11 years, and she was a proud K-State supporter who built deep, long-lasting relationships with athletic directors and students alike.

Donna and Jack were servant leaders through and through, and they were recognized together as a couple as the Kansan Humanitarians of the Year in 2018.

What a legacy this great couple leaves behind for their children and grandchildren to emulate and remember them by, and what a blessing for Jack to join his wife, Donna, to rest with our Lord.

To Mary, Marty, John, and their children, and to all of Jack and Don-

na's family who were blessed by the love of this great couple, my thoughts and prayers are with you all.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MARK FOWLER

Mr. MANN. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of a great Kansan, Mark Fowler, and to mourn his untimely passing at the age of 52 at his home in Manhattan on February 20.

Mark grew up on his family's farm near Emporia, Kansas. He earned a bachelor's degree in Milling Science and Management from Kansas State University, and later returned to complete a master's degree in agricultural economics. He began his career as a flour miller, first for Cargill, and then Seaboard.

In those roles, Mark ran flour mills, which worked on projects in several developing countries, including Ecuador, Guyana, and Haiti, and worked as a technical director of the African Division within Seaboard's Overseas Group in Durban, South Africa.

Mark was the president and CEO of Farmer Direct Foods, a farmer-owned, flour milling company in New Cambria, Kansas, after which he moved into his most recent role at U.S. Wheat, where he originally served as vice president of overseas operations.

Mark once said that he wanted to advance the U.S. wheat export market development mission because, through his work overseas, he experienced the global impact of wheat milling.

Mark's dedicated service helped hungry people all over the world, and he will be sorely missed.

To his colleagues and friends, his widow, Courtney, his daughters Piper and Paige, his mother Ruth Fowler, and his sisters Rhonda and Amy, you are in my thoughts and prayers as you mourn Mark's passing.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ANDY MCCURRY

Mr. MANN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of a

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1155

great Kansan, Andrew J. McCurry, who passed away on February 12 at his home in Burrton, Kansas, surrounded by his loving family.

Andy was born in 1950 in Hutchinson, Kansas. After studying animal science and industry at Kansas State University, he and his wife, Mary, started their registered Angus operation Marands Angus, which later became McCurry Angus Ranch.

As third- and fourth-generation Angus breeders, Andy and his family built a legacy all their own while carrying on the traditions of their ancestors.

Andy spent a lifetime pounding posts by hand, making a suitable place for hosting cattle sales, chuckwagon cookouts, livestock judging teams, and visitors from across the U.S. Ultimately, he built a place to raise both his family and world-class Angus cattle by the sweat of his brow.

Andy's gift was the ability to meet people from all walks of life and spend time getting to know them, and his network of friends was nationwide.

Later in life, Andy pursued another career as a pharmacist. He attended the University of Kansas School of Pharmacy, graduated in 1990, after which he worked as a pharmacist in the Hutchinson, Kansas, area for 30 years, retiring on his 70th birthday in 2020.

Because of his career-change experience, Andy was able to come alongside young people and help them find direction in their lives. He encouraged so many.

To Andy's wife, Mary; his son, John; his daughter, Emily; and all his grandchildren, you have my prayers as you gather together to remember Andy's loving impact.

Andy's legacy lives on in so many ways, especially in the cattle his family still produces. I know the first bull sale without Andy will be a tough one, but what a way to honor his legacy by continuing on the tradition he loved so much.

I will be praying for you tomorrow during the sale that your family would have peace, Andy would be honored, and that the bulls would set new records.

#### REDUCING VETERAN SUICIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD) for 5 minutes.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, last month President Biden announced a vision to advance progress on his Unity Agenda in the year ahead. I am encouraged by the agenda's focus on reducing veteran suicide, which has been one of my highest priorities since coming to Congress. I am encouraged by the specific focus on expanding outreach to justice-involved veterans, who may be at even greater risk for suicide.

In recent years, we have seen some signs of progress on this issue. From 2018 to 2020, age- and sex-adjusted vet-

eran suicide rates fell by nearly 10 percent.

However, with nearly 17 veterans still dying by suicide every day—a rate that is more than 50 percent higher than suicides among nonveteran adults—we know that we have much more work to do to save lives.

Part of the administration's agenda is an important focus on increasing lethal means safety, which is an intentional, voluntary practice to reduce suicide risk by limiting access by those in crisis to lethal means, like medication, firearms, and sharp instruments that can be used to inflict self-directed violence.

The data on lethal means safety are clear. People who reduce their access to lethal means during times of heightened risk are reducing their risk of dying by suicide.

Given the robust evidence on the effectiveness of lethal means safety in preventing suicide, the Trump administration implemented a requirement for every clinician at the Veterans Health Administration to complete a lethal means safety training so that they would be prepared to have conversations with the veterans they care for about this lifesaving practice.

Thanks to this requirement, nearly 100 percent of Veterans Health Administration clinicians have completed the Department's lethal means safety training. However, the training remains optional for all other staff, including at the Veterans Health Administration, Veterans Benefits Administration, vet centers, and vocational rehabilitation facilities.

This lack of a mandate has consequences. Without a requirement to do so, a mere fraction of 1 percent of VA's nonclinical employees have completed the Department's lethal means safety training. What this means is that every day we have veterans who could be in crisis interacting with VA employees who might be able to identify risk factors and have lifesaving conversations, but these VA staff are not trained to do so, and we could be losing our veterans because of it.

That is unacceptable, and that is why I introduced the Lethal Means Safety Training Act, which would make the Department's evidence-based training a requirement for all VA staff who regularly interact with veterans in their work, as well as community providers and family caregivers.

I will continue my work to get this passed in Congress, but no legislation is needed to expand VA's existing training requirement to other VA employees. Unfortunately, the administration's announcement last month did not include any plans for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use his existing authority to expand the Department's lethal means safety training requirement.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs already has the authority to take this lifesaving action today, and I once again call on him to do so immediately.

Every day that VA does not take this simple step is another day that we are leaving valuable tools in our toolbox unused. It is another day that we will lose nearly 17 veterans to suicide.

Not every single death can be prevented with an expanded lethal means safety training requirement, but at no cost to the Department and with no need for additional legislation, there is no reason to further delay on implementing this policy.

The Secretary has an opportunity to help save the lives of our veterans with the stroke of his pen, and I urge him to do so immediately, by expanding the Department's lethal means safety training requirement to all staff who regularly interact with veterans in their work. This step would build on the meaningful actions the Secretary has already taken and other steps announced by the President last month.

#### SECRETARY BUTTIGIEG SHOULD RESIGN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to demand accountability. Pete Buttigieg has shown he is unfit to lead the Department of Transportation and must resign immediately.

From his first day in office, he has been more focused on diversity training and identity politics than on building and maintaining America's transportation system. He has abandoned his Department's mission of improving safety, technology, and efficiency of our infrastructure in favor of promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives.

Case in point: The horrific train derailment in East Palestine, Ohio. Buttigieg took 10 days to acknowledge this incident and 3 weeks to show up and support the community.

As Ohioans fled their homes and worried about their health, the Secretary of Transportation was on TV whining about too many White people in construction industries. His policies have continuously put the wokes before the folks, and we are again seeing the consequences.

After seeing another Norfolk Southern train derail this weekend, I was reminded of the fact that the company wrote to shareholders stating that it is focused on DEI. This administration's focus on DEI is forcing private companies to rethink their goals, and one has to wonder, if Norfolk Southern's DEI policies are directing resources away from the important things, like greasing wheel bearings.

This insanity must stop. Speaking of insanity, it looks like Secretary Buttigieg is spending a lot of taxpayer money flying on private jets, but he doesn't want the American people to know where he is going or why.

I don't know about you, but I seem to recall a recent Health and Human

Services Secretary being forced to resign over this same exact thing.

Anyway, why is the DOT refusing to tell the American people how much Secretary Buttigieg's 23 flights on private jets have cost them?

Maybe the Secretary should just come to Capitol Hill and answer these questions for himself. It would be a cheap trip, and it wouldn't require airfare.

Either way, it is time for him to resign. That will allow him time to promote wokeness and take private jets on his own dime and his own time.

#### CELEBRATING THE WOMEN OF THE DIVINE NINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the women of the Divine Nine, the historically Black sororities of the National Pan-Hellenic Council.

I am proud to honor the organizations that have produced some of our Nation's best and brightest leaders. For over 100 years, these organizations have fostered and empowered generations of Black women to become leaders in government, business, academia, and so much more.

I am not exaggerating when I say these historically Black sororities have shaped the course of history.

I want to take a moment to salute each sorority.

Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority—their colors are salmon pink and apple green—was founded in 1908 at Howard University. Their mission: Service to all mankind. Their sisterhood proudly boasts Vice President KAMALA HARRIS; also my colleagues, Congresswomen SHEILA JACKSON LEE, TERRI SEWELL, FREDERICA WILSON, ALMA ADAMS, BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN, LAUREN UNDERWOOD, EMILIA SYKES, and LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER.

□ 1015

I salute former Congresswoman Eddie Bernice Johnson and also members of their membership, civil rights leaders Rosa Parks and Coretta Scott King, and their honorable president, Danette Anthony Reed.

Next, we have Delta Sigma Theta. Their colors are crimson and cream, founded in 1913 at Howard University. Delta's motto is "intelligence is the torch of wisdom."

Delta counts as sisters, my esteemed colleagues YVETTE CLARKE, JOYCE BEATTY, STACEY PLASKETT, LUCY MCBATH, SUMMER LEE, JASMINE CROCKETT, VALERIE FOUSHEE, and our newest Member, JENNIFER MCCLELLAN. I also salute former Congresswoman Val Demings and our HUD Secretary, Marsha Fudge.

Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm was the first African-American woman elected to Congress, and she also was a member of Delta Sigma Theta. Their

honorable president is Elsie Cooke-Holmes.

Next, we have Zeta Phi Beta Sorority. Their colors are blue and white. It was founded in 1920 at Howard University. Zeta's founding principles are scholarship, service, sisterhood, and finer womanhood.

My colleague Congresswoman SYDNEY KAMLAGER-DOVE is a member of Zeta Phi Beta, as well as former Congresswoman Donna Edwards and the late Congresswoman Julia Carson. They boast as members Anita Hill and author Zora Neale Hurston. Their honorable president is Stacie NC Grant.

Last but not least, my sorority, Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority. We wear the colors of royal blue and gold. We were founded in 1922 at Butler University, just celebrating our 100th year.

My sisters in Sigma are Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, as well as the late Congresswoman Lindy Boggs, and former Congresswoman Corrine Brown. In our membership is the first African-American winner of an Academy Award, Hattie McDaniel, and the first African-American woman journalist to cover the White House, Alice Allison Dunnigan. Our esteemed grand basileus is Rasheeda S. Liberty.

The women of the Divine Nine have driven progress on everything from women's suffrage to civil rights. These organizations were instrumental to the end of the brutal regime of Jim Crow. Alumnae have also made advancements in industry, medicine, entertainment, and more.

In short, the historically Black sororities have been critical to the advancement of Black women in America and have changed history for the better.

Our work is far from done. The strength and solidarity of these organizations is needed now more than ever.

In just the first months of 2023, our country continues to see efforts to turn back the clock on fundamental civil rights. Black people are still not safe in their own communities. Black people have less say in their government, and voting rights are being chipped away. The threat of racist violence is still painfully present in too many communities.

I have so much hope in the new generation of leaders that begin their journey as college students with Alpha Kappa Alpha, Delta Sigma Theta, Zeta Phi Beta, or Sigma Gamma Rho. Each year, more young people go out into the world to make our country a better place.

The road ahead is long, but I am confident that our coalitions for justice and equality will only grow because of the continued strength of the women of the Divine Nine along with our five historically Black fraternities.

#### WESTERN WATER CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Speaker, I rise today to shed light on a critical dilemma in the fight to address the worst drought facing the American West in 12 centuries.

Right now, water managers are doing everything they can to address and respond to the ongoing Western water crisis. At the same time, they cannot always readily access the critical data they need to measure water loss, respond effectively, and keep more water in Lake Mead for Nevadans.

I have said it before, and I will say it again: We can't manage what we cannot measure.

Nevada's plentiful sunshine is one of our State's greatest assets. It makes our State a top destination for outdoor recreation, the solar center of our transition to clean energy. It is also a key driver in evapotranspiration, or ET, water loss in Nevada, throughout the West, and across this country.

The situation at Lake Mead and across the West remains dire. We need to take action now. The future of our water supplies depends on us getting this information into the hands of people who are on the ground tackling this crisis every day.

That is why I am introducing the bipartisan, bicameral Open Access Evapotranspiration Data Act to formally establish a Federal OpenET program and fill the biggest data gap in water management by making critical ET data more accessible.

It will allow everyone access, from water managers and experts like scientists, academics, and advocacy organizations to farmers and ranchers to literally anyone with internet access; it is that accessible.

There is no time to waste in protecting our most precious resource. It is time to start better measuring, managing, and planning to protect Nevada's future.

#### INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Speaker, I rise today on International Women's Day as a woman in Congress who has served not one, not two, but three terms in this House where every single time we have shattered the record for the largest number of women serving in this body.

A woman's place is in this House, and I am honored to serve alongside such strong trailblazers who are setting the stage for the next generation of girls who will undoubtedly continue to shatter this glass ceiling.

We are not there yet. While women make up the largest voting bloc in the United States of America, we are still a minority here in the people's House. That is why I tell every little girl I meet crisscrossing southern Nevada to dream big and run for something.

Just over 100 years ago, we didn't have the right to vote in this country, and that is why so many of the laws and flaws of our system are stacked against us; whether that is equal pay for equal work, affordable childcare, adequate healthcare coverage for

mothers, and equitable access for women of color who continue to face disproportionately high maternal mortality rates, or the right to make our own decisions with our own bodies.

Today marks the first International Women's Day since the Supreme Court obliterated our rights less than a year ago in overturning 50 years of Roe; 50 years of a woman's right to choose.

In States across this country, the right to an abortion is under attack even in cases of rape, incest, and the health of a mother.

In this House there are extreme proposals to set us all backwards with a national ban on abortion. We will not go back, and we will not be intimidated.

I am proud to be from the Battle Born State, home of a majority woman Federal delegation in Congress, home of a majority woman State Supreme Court, and home of the first woman majority State legislature.

That is worth celebrating today. That is the model for this House by, for, and of the people. This is what I hope will inspire the next generation of girls to run, win, and lead our country forward.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY IS NOT AN UNEARNED HANDOUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOYLE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. HOYLE of Oregon. Madam Speaker, in my district, the average per capita income is \$32,000 a year. That is six counties from Lincoln County, down the coast of Oregon, to Curry County and the California border.

Over 160,000 seniors in my district rely on Social Security for retirement.

My colleagues across the aisle are approaching Social Security as if it is an unearned handout, and that is beyond offensive. This is not what it was meant to do. This is not what it was meant to be. People have paid into this system for their whole lives. They should be able to get their contributions back. That is the promise of our Social Security program.

Right now, we only tax income up to \$160,000 a year to fund Social Security. Millionaires and billionaires who get their income from investments instead of earning a paycheck through hard work are not paying their fair share into Social Security at all, and we must change that system.

By finally requiring that the wealthiest Americans pay into Social Security at the same rate as hardworking nurses and firefighters across this country, we can expand benefits and not cut them.

My bill, the Social Security Expansion Act, which I introduced with Representative JAN SCHAKOWSKY and Senator BERNIE SANDERS, would allow us to increase the Social Security benefits for everyone by \$200 a month and help account for the inflation that has impacted many seniors in my district and across this country.

This bill would also extend the solvency of this critical program for the next 75 years.

I am not in Congress to protect billionaires. I am here to make sure those people who have paid into this system for their whole lives, who have worked so hard, including our fishermen, electricians, and schoolteachers can retire with dignity. We can welcome a new generation of the workforce as they retire.

It is our responsibility to make sure that Social Security can be successful into the future, and I am proud to have a bill that helps protect that.

#### CELEBRATING INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate International Women's Day and to recognize that there are many faiths in this Nation, but in some of our faith the Book of Proverbs talks about the virtuous woman. I would like to emphasize that theme in its broadness.

The virtuousness of women across the land and around the world is to be able to acknowledge the very unique and specific duties and responsibilities and vulnerabilities that women have and to celebrate them in every aspect of life.

Today, in America, women get up and go to work in blue-collar labor jobs for low hourly wages—from waitresses to bus drivers to working in the building trades to being in jobs that barely make ends meet—tough jobs—but giving them a better way of life. They have never refused their assignment. They are the caretakers. They are the loving moms. The little ones grab their legs and look to them for hope and survival.

I pay tribute to those women, the everyday women, ordinary women doing extraordinary things. Thank you to America's women.

Then I take to this podium to honor those women in conflict, the women protecting their children in Ukraine, fighting in the battles in uniform in the Ukrainian military.

I honor those women who fell in battle. I honor those women who fell under the vicious bombing and brutality of Russia's desperate Vladimir Putin in this horrible war with Ukraine.

I honor the women in Sudan. I honor the women from Pakistan to India. I honor the women in Syria and Turkiye in the midst of this horrible earthquake. I honor impoverished women, women who are barely surviving on the continent of Africa and South and Central America. I honor the migrant women who are struggling to give their family a better life.

It is important that I recognize and honor the civil rights fighters. This weekend, we spent time honoring

Bloody Sunday that our late colleague John Lewis reminded us of, the moment of fighting for voting rights. We know that Sister Boynton, Coretta Scott King, so many women—Viola Liuzzo—fought in the civil rights movement nonviolently and are no longer here with us by loss of life from natural causes but others who were simply murdered because they believed in civil rights.

I am here to honor those in my own community. It is important to take note of Willie Bell Boone, Beulah Shepard, Etta Crockett, who is fighting for her life, but has been an enormous strength in our community, believing in not only civil rights but the process of voting and empowerment.

I honor my grandmother Olive Jackson; my grandmother Vannie Bennett; my big grandmother Mrs. Sims. I honor—called big mother, of course—my mother, Ivalita Jackson; my Aunt Valrie Bennett, and my other close aunts, Sybil Gooden and Sarah Jackson.

These women molded me and indicated that in spite of the segregated life you lived in, that all things are possible.

□ 1030

It is important today, as we honor the international women suffering, fighting still for their freedom and their dignity, that we honor those who have fallen by way of age or disaster.

We honor those in my own community in Houston. I honor my former women mayors, Kathy Whitmire and Annise Parker, in Houston, Texas, and recognize that women are still striving.

On this day, I make a pronouncement that I want to take a hammer to the scourge of domestic violence with brutality and guns against women. I want to stop the scourge of human trafficking, where young girls and women are the largest victims.

When we come to this podium to talk about International Women's Day, we must come with action and maybe even an iron fist that is, in fact, strong and nonviolent but with a commitment that we will stand for things that will draw us to make life better for these women who are there every single day.

I want to make sure that I pay tribute to those who molded me outside of my home. Thank you to the teachers of America, some going unapplauded, some going unappreciated, some going uncompensated. Thank you to America's teachers. I could not be where I was or am today without public school education. Who was in it? It was our teachers.

Madam Speaker, I say to you: International Women's Day is a day of honor and a day of action.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 32 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAMMACK) at noon.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, to You all hearts are open, all desires are known, and from You no secrets are hid. Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts, that we may approach You today without guile or self-righteousness.

Accept the desires of our hearts, desires for peace in our world, especially in Ukraine, Taiwan, and Myanmar. Grant us wisdom to know how You are calling us to respond to the severity of the humanitarian needs, the atrocity of offenses upon the innocent, the infringement on territorial and ideological integrity.

On this International Women's Day, make us keenly aware of the mothers, daughters, and small girls whose lives are in imminent danger at the hands of the enemy. Hear their voices and amplify them, that we would respond to their cries for freedom and safety.

The eyes of the Lord are in every place, observing the wicked and the good. Let not then the secrets of evildoers be hidden from Your watchful eye. But to You may each give account for their iniquity.

We stand before You today with hope for Your mercy and the promise of Your salvation.

In Your sovereign name we pray.  
Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. VALADAO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now entertain up to 15 re-

quests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### EVENTUALLY THE RAIN WILL STOP

(Mr. VALADAO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, this week, California is preparing for more atmospheric rivers that are bringing much-needed rain to our State.

This is welcome news to the Central Valley farmers who have suffered through the last 3 years of exceptional drought.

While I am grateful for this rain, and I know my fellow farmers are, as well, we have all seen this situation before. Eventually this rain will stop.

That is why it is critical to capture and store as much of this rain as physically possible so we don't put ourselves in this type of situation with another man-made water shortage again.

Extreme environmentalists and Sacramento bureaucrats have grossly mismanaged our water with complex and contradictory laws and regulations that control how much we are able to pump and what storage projects we are able to move forward with.

While I am grateful for the Governor for his temporary relief that he pushed for a few weeks back, we cannot let this water go to waste. We must maximize what can be moved at all times through the delta and invest in water storage infrastructure and conveyance projects so we can capture and store this critical resource. Thousands of livelihoods and the future of agriculture production in California and countless Americans we feed depend on it.

#### WELCOMING THE TOWING AND RECOVERY ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to welcome the Towing and Recovery Association of America to Washington and thank them for their work.

Tow truck operators from nearly 20 States are attending to advocate on behalf of road safety. I have championed these issues for my entire career in Congress, but through the advocacy of TRAA, I have learned that tow truck operators and all our first responders face harrowing conditions during roadside emergency response. Even one roadside fatality is too many.

That is why I proudly introduced a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "move over" laws to raise awareness of the need to move over and slow down while passing roadside responders.

Last year, the House adopted this resolution, and the Transportation and

Infrastructure Committee just voted to advance it again this year. This is not a partisan issue.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to send a message by joining me in support of this resolution. Together we can save lives.

#### ACKNOWLEDGING WOMEN IN SMALL BUSINESS

(Mr. SANTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today for International Women's Day to acknowledge women in small business from New York's Third Congressional District.

Pam Ocasio from Pam's Jamz—with a z—is a mom with a talent for curating unique homemade jams and marmalades from local ingredients. She is always at the local farmers market in Oyster Bay with a smiling face and a can-do attitude.

Another wonder woman, Angela Carillo, is a mother of two from Bethpage with an associate's degree in medical technology and a bachelor's degree in biology. She put her chemistry skills to the test in her basement studio in 2010 curating beautiful and fabulously scented home soaps. I have seen her work at local craft fairs around the district, and I must say, she certainly gives any major manufacturer a run for their money.

Joey Bowen is a mother of two who built her business as a single mom. Joey lives in Bethpage and hand makes stylish clear handbags. She started in her living room and expanded to an international operation. She now has storefronts around Nassau County and supports the local economy and the workforce.

Cheers to all these women out there and for their extraordinary accomplishments.

#### IN MEMORY OF JASON ARNO

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, last week the Buffalo Fire Department lost a brother, and western New York lost a hero in the line of duty during a four-alarm fire on Main Street in the city of Buffalo.

Jason Arno was a 3-year member of the Buffalo Fire Department serving at Engine 2, one of the busiest companies in the city.

A son, a brother, a husband, a father, and a friend, Jason was committed to putting his life on the line each day for the community that he loved.

As our city mourns this tragic loss, we are once again reminded of the bravery and the sacrifice it takes as a first responder.

While Jason is laid to rest this Friday, our hearts are heavy. Our thoughts are with the Arno family, the

western New York community, and his brothers and sisters of Buffalo Professional Firefighters Local 282.

The city of good neighbors and a grateful nation are forever indebted to firefighter Jason Arno for his selfless sacrifice.

#### UKRAINE FREEDOM CRUCIAL

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, last week, The Washington Times featured a thoughtful open letter from Clifford D. May, president of the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, to President Biden. He wrote: "Dear Mr. President, first, kudos to you for going to Kyiv."

"For the past year, you've been providing the Ukrainians enough weapons to prevent them from losing but not enough . . . to drive out the [Putin] invaders. Why not ask such military experts as retired General Jack Keane what's necessary to get the job done as fast as possible?"

"The moral argument for supporting Ukraine is obvious to most people but you still haven't made clear why its defense is a vital American national interest. . . . The rulers of neoimperialist Russia, Communist China, and Islamic Iran share a goal: the diminishment—if not death—of the United States."

In conclusion, God bless our troops who successfully protected America for 20 years as the global war on terrorism continues moving from the Afghanistan safe haven to America.

Congratulations, Ambassador Georgi Panayotov, for the Library of Congress National Bulgaria Day reception.

#### HARRIET TUBMAN DAY

(Mr. ESPAILLAT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, the contributions of women run deep throughout the history of America and the fabric of our entire Nation.

One such woman was Harriet Tubman, who escaped slavery and dedicated her life's mission to ensuring freedom for others.

Building a network of abolitionists, Harriet Tubman organized safe houses throughout the Underground Railroad, including in my district, while making rescues and freeing others who were previously enslaved.

As she put it, there are one of two things that she had a right to—liberty or death.

Madam Speaker, on International Women's Day and 2 days before Harriet Tubman Day, we remember her. When we look at young girls in Afghanistan and we look at young girls in other parts of the world like Iran seeking to have education, we remember Harriet Tubman. When we fight for equal pay for equal work, we remember Harriet

Tubman. When we fight and advocate for a woman's right to choose, we remember Harriet Tubman. When we help those mothers that try to seek asylum at the border with their children, Madam Speaker, we remember Harriet Tubman.

Let's remember Harriet Tubman today as we celebrate International Women's Day.

#### CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF LEWIS BEAR

(Mr. GAETZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to rise and celebrate the life of one of the greatest Florida men to have ever lived: Lewis Bear.

Lewis was a legend for all times. He was a prolific businessman and an even more prolific philanthropist. Lewis was CEO of Florida's oldest privately held company, the Lewis Bear Company. It was started by his grandfather in 1876. Lewis grew this small family grocery distribution business to one of Florida's largest beer distributors. If you have cracked open a beer in my district, there is a pretty good chance that Lewis moved it.

Lewis' generosity did not stop with libations. Through the Lewis Bear Family Foundation, he donated tens of millions of dollars to local organizations and charities, including hospitals and nonprofits focused on curing childhood cancer. He single-handedly protected the Deepwater Horizon oil spill settlement funds for northwest Florida and saw that the money was used for lasting economic development.

I know that Lewis will be sorely missed by our family and by his family, especially by his wife, Belle, and their three children: Lewis, Cindi, and David.

Northwest Florida will never be the same without Lewis Bear. We are certainly grateful that we had my friend for 82 years.

#### CONGRESS MUST ADDRESS STUDENT DEBT

(Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today as an educator who spent 10 years as a college instructor and administrator to support the President's student debt relief plan, which is now currently under threat by the Supreme Court.

When I was in the classroom, I saw my students taking out loans to pay for basic needs like rent or food. We tell young people to get an education, to go to college, to work toward your chance at the American Dream, but for so many, that means taking out tens of thousands of dollars in student loans.

Student loan debt also disproportionately impacts low-income students, and millions of students may not have access to financial training or advice.

To this day, I am also paying off my student loans, and I have former students who continue to struggle with student debt years after they have graduated.

Yes, we need to do more to address college affordability and access, but we must address student debt.

If the Supreme Court takes the dangerous, irresponsible step of ending relief to student borrowers, then Congress has a duty to codify the President's debt relief plan and protect these 40 million Americans.

#### GET OUR FISCAL HOUSE IN ORDER

(Mr. FULCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, not long ago, America was the largest energy producer in the world. Gas was affordable, and groceries weren't worth an entire paycheck. These are not far-away memories from our country's bygone golden era—this was the reality for Americans just a few years ago.

Government spending has increased over \$9 trillion since President Biden has taken office. This predictably resulted in the highest inflation in four decades. American families have had to bear the brunt of this crisis, yet my colleagues on the other side of the aisle still seem to have no plan to tackle inflation outside of spending more taxpayer money.

House Republicans have been clear about our mission in 2023: set our fiscal house in order so that we can lower the cost of living for Americans. We can find solutions to our debt crisis by working on new budgetary framework focused on fiscal restraint.

Republicans' commitment to America offers tangible solutions to set us on that path—from strengthening our supply chains to enacting progrowth policies.

#### DELIVERING FOR RHODE ISLAND'S COMMERCIAL FISHING INDUSTRY

(Mr. MAGAZINER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAGAZINER. Madam Speaker, last month, I had the opportunity to visit the Port of Galilee in Narragansett, Rhode Island, one of the most productive commercial fishing ports in the entire Northeast. Galilee is home to more than 270 commercial fishing boats, supporting 3,500 jobs and landing more than 16 million pounds of seafood per year.

As a member of the Natural Resources Committee, I am committed to fighting for resources for America's ports and to supporting the commercial fishing industry, which is vital to how we feed our Nation and support our economy.

I am also introducing a bill to secure a voice for the Rhode Island fishing industry in the Mid-Atlantic Fishery

Management Council. I am proud to support and fight in Congress for Rhode Island's fishermen, and I encourage everyone to try the best seafood in America, which is Rhode Island seafood.

#### HONORING JUDGE FRANCES SECKINGER

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Judge Frances Seckinger, who passed away on March 2. I might also note that it is appropriate on International Women's Day to honor a great judge.

Judge Seckinger served in the judicial system when she was elected as a probate judge in Effingham County in 1977. That election sparked the beginning of a long and fruitful career in public service until her retirement in 2008. It is also important to note that Judge Seckinger's election made her the first female to hold an elected position in the Effingham County Judicial System.

Outside of her public service, Judge Seckinger was a faithful attendee of Springfield United Methodist Church, and she enjoyed hobbies such as crocheting blankets for friends and family. Judge Seckinger's selfless career of community service and her love for family and others should serve as an inspiration for all of us.

My condolences go out to Judge Seckinger's family, and I hope they know how grateful I am for her years of service.

#### ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. AGUILAR. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 205

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Bishop of Georgia.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mrs. McClellan (to rank immediately after Mr. Davis of North Carolina).

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr. Schneider.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mrs. McClellan (to rank immediately after Ms. Lee of Pennsylvania).

*Resolved*, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, ranked as follows on the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Panetta (to rank immediately after Mr. Doggett).

Mr. AGUILAR (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous con-

sent that the resolution be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 21, SYRIA WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider H. Con. Res. 21 in the House if called up by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or his designee; that the concurrent resolution be considered as read; that the previous question be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to adoption without intervening motion except for 1 hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by Representative McCaul of Texas, Representative MEEKS of New York, and Representative GAETZ of Florida or their respective designees; and that the provisions of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution, 50 U.S.C. 1546, shall not apply to H. Con. Res. 20.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 140, PROTECTING SPEECH FROM GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 27, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY; AND S. 619, COVID-19 ORIGIN ACT OF 2023

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 199 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 199

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 140) to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit Federal employees from advocating for censorship of viewpoints in their official capacity, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their respective designees. After general debate the

bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Accountability now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-1. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 27) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States'". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 619) to require the Director of National Intelligence to declassify information relating to the origin of COVID-19, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 4. The provisions of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546) shall not apply to a concurrent resolution introduced during the first session of the One Hundred Eighteenth Congress pursuant to



section 5 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544) with respect to Syria.

SEC. 5. If a veto message is laid before the House on House Joint Resolution 30, then after the message is read and the objections of the President are spread at large upon the Journal, further consideration of the veto message and the joint resolution shall be postponed until the legislative day of March 23, 2023; and on that legislative day, the House shall proceed to the constitutional question of reconsideration and dispose of such question without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the pending resolution with an amendment that I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 4 of the resolution and redesignate the subsequent section accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution is amended.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee met and reported House Resolution 199, providing for consideration of three measures: H.R. 140, H.J. Res. 27, and S. 619.

The rule provides for H.R. 140 to be considered under a structured rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their designees.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 27 under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

□ 1230

Additionally, the rule provides for consideration of S. 619, under closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Select Committee on Intelligence.

Finally, the rule postpones the vote on a potential veto message from the

President on H.J. Res. 30 until the legislative day of March 23.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding me time.

I thank our colleagues on the other side of the aisle for working with us on that unanimous consent, which I think is important. It is important for us to have a full debate and a full airing of the use of war powers in the United States.

As James Madison pointed out, it was critically important that we put that power in Congress. We should have this debate. If we are going to have troops in Syria, this body, this House of Representatives, this Congress ought to speak to it; and we shouldn't hide behind a 2001 authorization of the use of military force and not update that authorization of the use of military force.

I am not here to say whether we should or should not be in Syria. I am here to say that Congress should speak to it. We should debate it. We should decide. We should have an actual conversation in this body, on this floor, when we are going to place our men and women in uniform in harm's way. That is the point that we should be considering.

I very much believe that the gentleman from Florida has brought something forward using privileged tools that we have here in the body, and that we should take that under consideration. We should support the resolution the gentleman has brought forward, and if we have concerns, we should then have a debate, a full-throated debate, about the use of military force and our men and women in uniform in Syria.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last night, the Rules Committee met and reported out a rule for three bills.

First, let me just say, this is an awful rule; and I don't want to hear my Republican colleagues talk about fairness or openness ever again. We got lecture after lecture about how they wanted to be more open and more inclusive.

Well, guess what? So far, in this Congress, 22 of the 26 rules have been completely closed. I mean, there are more closed rules in this rule than Democratic amendments made in order.

Speaker McCarthy promised he would open things up, but he has locked things down more than ever.

My colleague from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) said that he joined the Rules Committee to be our conscience. So I would ask him, I mean, does he think this is okay?

Madam Speaker, 43 of 44 amendments submitted by Democrats were blocked by his majority; is that right? Is that the openness that we were promised by his Speaker?

The bottom line is the last time Republicans controlled the House they

had more closed rules than any other time in the history of our country, and they are on track to beating their own record.

Our first bill today, considered under a closed rule, is S. 619, the COVID-19 Origin Act of 2023.

I think I speak for everyone when I say that we all want to know how COVID started. But I also want to point out, for the RECORD, that Donald Trump was President when COVID started, not Joe Biden.

Donald Trump said: "China has been working very hard to contain the coronavirus. The United States greatly appreciates their efforts and transparency. It will all work out well." Joe Biden didn't say that.

What Joe Biden actually did do is he ordered this investigation, and thanks to his investigation and the work of the intelligence community, we now have a report that gives us some answers.

The gentleman from Kentucky says, Democrats all believe this was a conspiracy theory. Yet, strangely enough, it was a Democratic President who told the intelligence community to look into the origins of COVID. So I am just a bit confused here as to his logic.

I will quickly mention two other bills. H.J. Res 27, also considered under a closed rule, seeks to roll back a majority of the protections on rivers, lakes, and streams that have been implemented since the creation of the Clean Water Act.

I find it particularly ironic that Republicans go to East Palestine, Ohio, saying, we stand with you, we are with you, while here in Congress, they are passing a bill that makes it easier for the company that dumped toxic waste into their rivers to get off scot-free.

Finally, we have H.R. 140, the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act, which does not protect free speech from government interference. In fact, it seeks to expand the First Amendment to include Vladimir Putin and the Chinese Communist Party, while telling America's own Federal law enforcement agencies that they are now forbidden from even notifying social media companies of attempts by Russia and the CCP to spread propaganda.

But there is one more thing I want to bring up today, Madam Speaker, and it is not in this rule, but it is just as important and consequential for our democracy.

On Monday of this week, FOX News aired an offensive, dishonest, shameful representation about what happened on January 6, 2021. For nearly an hour, Tucker Carlson said that January 6 was not, in fact, a violent attack on American democracy. In fact, he said it was not an attack at all.

He called it a peaceful sightseeing day; downplayed what happened; tried to sanitize and gloss over the first responders who were attacked and died; called the people attacking our Capitol Police officers meek; ran interference



for a racist mob that came into these Halls that day to overturn an election.

I am furious because I was here that day. I was literally in this room. I was one of the last ones off the House floor. I sat in the Speaker's chair that day. I saw how close we came to disaster, and I don't need Tucker Carlson or anyone else to tell me what happened that day.

I am not just furious for me; I am furious for the people he lied to. I am furious for the memory of the officers he insulted. I am furious for the police officers who were beaten and injured that day. I am furious for the staff who thought that they were going to die.

January 6 was an attack on our democracy, and now Tucker Carlson has chosen to side with the enemies of democracy.

But what is most alarming about all of this, what is most dangerous, is that he was aided and abetted by Republican Speaker of the House KEVIN MCCARTHY.

I have to say, this is a new low. Speaker MCCARTHY's treacherous decision to coordinate with Tucker Carlson to deliberately distort what happened that day is beyond the pale; and the worst part is the blatant lying.

On November 21, 2020, Carlson said in a private text that lies about voter fraud were shockingly reckless and called the very conspiracy theories he was promoting on the air as insane and absurd to his colleagues.

He called those propagating the big lie dangerous as hell. He knew that claims the election was stolen were dangerous lies.

But instead of owning up to the truth, he went on TV, and with zero respect for his viewers and for the people of this country, zero respect for the truth, zero respect for our democracy, he sold those dangerous lies to the American people. He should be ashamed.

Speaker MCCARTHY's disgraceful decision to help him spread these lies will forever be a stain on this institution.

So my question for the Speaker is: Was it worth it?

Was the backroom deal with the far right to help Tucker Carlson lie about what happened that day worth the damage done to our democracy?

Was it worth insulting the memory of the law enforcement officers who died defending this building and what it symbolizes?

The family of fallen Officer Brian Sicknick doesn't think so. I want to enter their full statement into the RECORD today, but our rules prevent me from doing that. So let me just read a part of it here:

"The Sicknick family is outraged at the ongoing attack on our family by the unscrupulous and outright sleazy so-called news network of FOX News who will do the bidding of Trump or any of his sycophant followers, no matter what damage is done to the families of the fallen, the officers who put their lives on the line, and all who suffered on January 6 due to the lies started by

Trump and spread by sleaze-slinging outlets like FOX."

They go on to say: "Every time the pain of that day seems to have ebbed a bit, organizations like FOX rip our wounds wide open again and we are frankly sick of it."

That is what Speaker MCCARTHY is doing here. It is sick. It is indefensible. Frankly, I find it disgusting.

So when the hell will House Republicans stand up here and say this is wrong?

At least some Senate Republicans, to their credit, have actually denounced Carlson's lies.

Senator JOHN KENNEDY said: "I was here. It was not peaceful. It was an abomination."

Senator THOM TILLIS says: Tucker's depiction was B.S. He called it indefensible.

Senator MITT ROMNEY says: "You can't hide the truth by selectively picking a few minutes out of tapes and saying this is what went on. It's so absurd. It's nonsense. It's a very dangerous thing to do. . . ."

But all we get out of this side of the Capitol is deafening silence; and every moment House Republicans do not come out and condemn these evil lies, more damage is done to the fabric of our democracy because, mark my words, January 6 will happen again if we do not correct the record and tell the truth about what happened that day.

It was an attempt to overthrow the government of the United States, based on lies spread by the former President of the United States. So for the sake of this institution, for the sake of the country, it is time to tell the truth.

For my Republican colleagues, it is time for you to condemn these lies.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation, H.R. 140, which went through regular order, which was marked up in the Oversight and Reform Committee, where Democrats had copious opportunities to offer amendments and to change the bill, as did Republicans.

H.R. 140 is called the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act, and would prohibit Federal employees from using their official authority to censor a private entity, including outside of normal duty hours or away from an employee's normal duty post.

Under President Biden, administration officials and Federal bureaucrats have abused their positions, authority, and influence to encourage censorship and erode Americans' First Amendment rights.

Recently released reports have uncovered efforts by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Centers for Disease Control, the Department of Homeland Security, and other government

agencies to pressure social media companies and internet providers to censor and remove speech posted on social media platforms.

Advocates for this censorship flag certain posts and users as spreading misinformation on various topics, including COVID-19, racial justice, and the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan.

Executives at Facebook and Twitter have admitted that prior to the 2020 Presidential election, after a warning from the FBI, they censored the sharing of news regarding Hunter Biden's laptop leak, which has since been proven true. It was not a Russian disinformation campaign.

Even former White House Press Secretary Jen Psaki, during a July 2021 press briefing, called on Facebook to ban specific accounts from its platform.

Congress should recognize that the biggest spreader of misinformation over the last several years, whether it has been about elections or about COVID, has been the Federal Government.

The censorship must stop. Congress must restore constitutional protections enshrined in the First Amendment.

H.R. 140, and the amendments that are pending votes here as well, are critical to ensure that government officials can never again promote censorship and pressure private entities to suppress Americans' First Amendment rights.

Additionally, the rule before us provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 27, a resolution "providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of Title 5, United States Code, of the rules submitted by the Department of the Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense, and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Revised definition of 'Waters of the United States.'"

It is Groundhog Day again in America. Every time the administration changes, this rule changes.

The Biden administration's new rule would radically redefine the term "Waters of the United States" to expand the Federal Government's authority in regulating bodies of water.

Specifically, Biden's EPA would expand the term to include impoundments of jurisdictional waters, tributaries, adjacent wetlands, and additional waters.

□ 1245

To be clear, what the Biden administration is pushing through here will heap serious burdens on farmers, small businesses, homebuilders, and rural communities across our country.

In 1972, Congress didn't tell the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers: Do whatever you think is necessary to protect water. That is not what the bill said. Yet, that is what they have taken as their directive.

The Clean Water Act was never intended to be applied as broadly as the

Biden administration is proposing. Every Member of Congress should be concerned about the EPA's attempt to expand its authority over individuals' private property and regulate farms and communities, even those which lie far away from any lakes, rivers, or streams and very far away from Washington, D.C.

Congress has the constitutional authority and responsibility to provide oversight and to review regulations issued by the executive branch. If the executive branch promulgates rules that could overstep their authority, as President Biden is doing here, it is vital that we exercise our oversight authority in Congress.

Finally, the rule before us provides for consideration of S. 619, the COVID-19 Origin Act of 2023, which would finally declassify any information relating to potential links between the Wuhan Institute of Virology and the origin of COVID-19.

In 2020, at the height of the pandemic, anyone who spoke out questioning whether COVID-19 might have come from the Wuhan lab in China was denounced as a conspiracy theorist, and their words were labeled as "dangerous misinformation." People were censored online, their accounts were suspended, and their reputations were damaged for questioning the origins of COVID-19.

What is the difference between COVID-19 conspiracy theory and the truth? About 2 years. We have seen them called natural immunity conspiracy theories. We have seen people who said masks don't work called conspiracy theorists. Now, we are finding out that all of those conspiracy theories, so-called, were accurate.

Fast-forward to today. Even the government admits it. The Department of Energy and the FBI have both publicly reported their conclusions that COVID-19 likely emerged as a result of a lab leak from the Wuhan Institute of Virology, a research institute in Wuhan, China, controlled by the People's Republic of China and, ultimately, the Chinese Communist Party.

Was it funded in part by our government? Yes, it was.

This legislation is long overdue and is necessary to expose the truth about the origins of COVID-19. Americans deserve to see the information. President Biden could have released this information at any point. It could have been released a year ago. It could be released today without this resolution. But this resolution is important because the President has not released this information. The last Congress, led by Speaker PELOSI, could have voted to do what we are doing here today. But no, they wanted it to remain hidden from the American public. I fear the Federal Government has been involved in a coverup about the origins of COVID-19 because they are afraid of being exposed as culpable in the creation of the disease at the center of the pandemic.

To my colleague's point about the videos that were released on Monday, I think the other side of the aisle is out of touch and out of step with the American public on this.

A recent poll by Rasmussen showed that 81 percent of likely voters believe that all of the tapes should be released. The Democrats had 2 years to release these tapes. But 81 percent of voters believe that.

Is that just Republicans? No.

Madam Speaker, 86 percent of Republicans and 78 percent of Democrats—they are out of step with their own party—believe that these videotapes should be released because Americans deserve to know the truth and the defendants in these trials deserve to have the evidence they need to present their defense.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD a USA Today piece titled: "Fact check: COVID-19 vaccines primarily designed to prevent serious illness, death."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[From USA TODAY, Jan. 21, 2022]

FACT CHECK: COVID-19 VACCINES PRIMARILY DESIGNED TO PREVENT SERIOUS ILLNESS, DEATH

(By Valerie Paviionis)

As the omicron variant surges across the world and the United States logs case numbers near and over 1 million per day, the virus is prompting scientists to develop new treatments and government officials to fight to curb the spread.

While the Biden administration continues to urge Americans to get vaccinated, a Jan. 10 Facebook post claims that Dr. Rochelle Walensky, director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, said vaccines can't prevent COVID-19 transmission. Other sites have shared the same claim, linking Walensky's words back to an interview with CNN in August 2021.

"Our vaccines are working exceptionally well," Walensky said to CNN's Wolf Blitzer in the interview. "They continue to work well for delta, with regard to severe illness and death—they prevent it. But what they can't do anymore is prevent transmission."

Though Walensky did say these words on CNN, the original interview was aired in early August, not recently. And while it's true vaccines can't entirely halt transmission, experts say they do reduce it—and reduce the chances of hospitalization and death—as USA TODAY previously reported.

USA TODAY reached out to the original poster of the claim for comment.

Various websites have written about the same claim, amassing thousands of interactions on Facebook.

VACCINE EFFECTS DEPEND ON SEVERAL FACTORS

In an email, Walensky spokesperson Kathleen Conley wrote that in August 2021—when the interview originally ran—the delta variant was the dominant variant in the United States.

Experts at that time said it was clear the vaccines provided protection.

"Vaccines provide significant protection from 'getting it'—infection—and 'spreading it'—transmission—even against the delta variant," a professor of immunobiology and molecular, cellular and developmental biology at Yale University, told USA TODAY in November.

However, Conley noted data did show vaccines were "less effective at preventing infections and transmission with Delta than with previous other variants." Omicron has proven even more difficult to contain.

While mRNA vaccines—produced by Pfizer and Moderna—continue to offer some level of protection against transmission of omicron, other vaccines—such as Johnson & Johnson, Sinopharm and AstraZeneca—offer "almost no defense," according to a Dec. 19, 2021, report by the New York Times.

Other factors beyond variant type, vaccination type and booster status can also influence whether or not a person contracts COVID-19.

Dr. David Dowdy, associate professor of epidemiology at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, said it's difficult to succinctly explain the vaccines' nuanced effects on transmission.

A vaccine might protect you from a passing interaction with someone at a grocery store, but it may not prevent infection from someone you live with and share air with for several hours a day.

"It gets very easy to misconstrue," Dowdy said. "If someone asks, do vaccines prevent infection, and you have to give a yes or no answer, then the answer is no, they're not a perfect blockade. But do the vaccines offer some protection against infection? The answer is yes."

VACCINES STILL PROTECT AGAINST SERIOUS DISEASE

While vaccinations don't offer perfect protection against the transmission of COVID-19, experts still urge people to get vaccinated.

According to Conley, COVID-19 vaccination remains effective against hospitalization and death caused by the virus. Getting a booster, she added, further decreases these risks, and the CDC continues to recommend that Americans receive vaccines and boosters.

Dr. Chris Beyrer, professor of public health and human rights at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, said both the mRNA and J&J vaccines were never designed to prevent infection entirely.

It's "very hard", he said, to prevent infection via an injected vaccine when you're dealing with a virus that enters the body through the nose and mouth. Instead, the vaccine trials were designed to study reduction in serious illness, hospitalization and death. All three vaccines were highly effective by this measure, Beyrer said.

"People who say, well, why would I take it if it doesn't prevent me from getting infected?" Beyrer said. "You have to remember that having a COVID-19 infection can be everything from completely asymptomatic . . . to a head-cold-like symptoms or full flu-like symptoms, all the way to death. So what the vaccines are doing is really dramatically increasing the likelihood that you will have mild infection. And that's incredibly important."

A CDC study released Jan. 21 showed booster shots of the Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna vaccines were 90 percent effective at preventing hospitalizations from the omicron variant.

OUR RATING: MISSING CONTEXT

Because it can be misleading without additional information, we rate MISSING CONTEXT the claim that the CDC director says vaccines can't prevent transmission of

COVID-19. While vaccines do not offer 100 protection against COVID-19 infection, they can still partially defend against infection. Vaccines remain effective at protecting from COVID-19-caused serious illness, hospitalization and death.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD an AP News article titled: "Ex-Twitter execs deny pressure to block Hunter Biden story."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[From the AP News, Feb. 8, 2023]

**EX-TWITTER EXECES DENY PRESSURE TO BLOCK HUNTER BIDEN STORY**

(By Farnoush Amiri and Barbara Ortutay)

WASHINGTON (AP).—House Republicans are expected to question former Twitter executives about the platform's handling of reporting on Hunter Biden, the president's son, fulfilling a party promise to investigate what they have long asserted is anti-conservative bias at social media companies.

Three former executives will be appearing Wednesday before the House Oversight and Accountability Committee to testify for the first time about the company's decision in the weeks before the 2020 election to initially block from Twitter a New York Post article about the contents of a laptop belonging to Hunter Biden.

The witnesses Republicans subpoenaed to testify are Vijaya Gadde, Twitter's former chief legal officer; James Baker, the company's former deputy general counsel; and Yoel Roth, former head of safety and integrity.

Democrats have a witness of their own, Anika Collier Navaroli, a former employee with Twitter's content moderation team. She testified last year to the House committee that investigated the Capitol riot about Twitter's preferential treatment of Donald Trump until the then-president was banned from Twitter two years ago.

The hearing is the GOP's opening act into what lawmakers promise will be a widespread investigation into President Joe Biden and his family, with the tech companies another prominent target of their oversight efforts.

"Americans deserve answers about this attack on the First Amendment and why Big Tech and the Swamp colluded to censor this information about the Biden family selling access for profit," Rep. James Comer of Kentucky, the committee chairman, said in a statement announcing the hearing.

The New York Post first reported in October 2020, weeks before the presidential election, that it had received from Trump's personal lawyer, Rudy Giuliani, a copy of a hard drive from a laptop that Hunter Biden had dropped off 18 months earlier at a Delaware computer repair shop and never retrieved. Twitter blocked people from sharing links to the story for several days.

Months later, Twitter's then-CEO, Jack Dorsey, called the company's communications around the Post article "not great." He added that blocking the article's URL with "zero context" around why it was blocked was "unacceptable."

The newspaper story was greeted at the time with skepticism due to questions about the laptop's origins, including Giuliani's involvement, and because top officials in the Trump administration had already warned that Russia was working to denigrate Joe Biden before the White House election.

The Kremlin had interfered in the 2016 race by hacking Democratic emails that were

subsequently leaked, and fears that Russia would meddle again in the 2020 race were widespread across Washington.

Just last week, lawyers for the younger Biden asked the Justice Department to investigate people who say they accessed his personal data. But they did not acknowledge that that data came from a laptop that Hunter Biden is purported to have dropped off at a computer repair shop.

The issue was also reignited recently after Elon Musk took over Twitter as CEO and began to release a slew of company information to independent journalists, what he has called the "Twitter Files."

The documents and data largely show internal debates among employees over the decision to temporarily censor the story about Hunter Biden. The tweet threads lacked substantial evidence of a targeted influence campaign from Democrats or the FBI, which has denied any involvement in Twitter's decision-making.

Nonetheless, Comer and other Republicans have used the Post story, which has not been independently verified by The Associated Press, as the basis for what they say is another example of the Biden family's "influence peddling."

One of the witnesses on Wednesday, Baker, is expected to be the target of even more Republican scrutiny.

Baker was the FBI's general counsel during the opening of two of the bureau's most consequential investigations in history: the Hillary Clinton investigation and a separate inquiry into potential coordination between Russia and Trump's 2016 presidential campaign. Republicans have long criticized the FBI's handling of both investigations.

For Democrats, Navaroli is expected to counter the GOP argument by testifying about how Twitter allowed Trump's tweets despite the misinformation they sometimes contained.

Navaroli testified to the Jan. 6 committee last year that Twitter executives often tolerated Trump's posts despite them including false statements and violations of the company's own rules because executives knew the platform was his "favorite and most-used . . . and enjoyed having that sort of power."

The Jan. 6 committee used Navaroli's testimony in one of its public hearings last summer but did not identify her by name.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, Twitter itself is saying the government isn't telling them to suppress anything. This is yet, unfortunately, just another Republican conspiracy theory.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD an article from The Hill titled: "Trump officials roll back Obama oil train safety rule."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[From The Hill, Sept. 24, 2018]

**TRUMP OFFICIALS ROLL BACK OBAMA OIL TRAIN SAFETY RULE**

(By Timothy Cama)

The Trump administration on Monday repealed a mandate that would have required trains carrying crude oil to use special brakes with new technology.

The Department of Transportation's Pipelines and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) said it undertook a congressionally mandated analysis of the provision in a 2015 regulation under which oil trains would have had to use electronically controlled pneumatic (ECP) brakes.

"The Department [of Transportation] determined that the expected benefits, including safety benefits, of implementing ECP brake system requirements do not exceed the associated costs of equipping tank cars with ECP brake systems, and therefore are not economically justified," PHMSA said.

The mandate to phase out traditional air brakes for crude oil use was part of a comprehensive rule that the Obama administration wrote in 2015 to try to improve the safety of crude oil trains.

Transporting crude oil by rail has increased dramatically in recent years due to a boost in domestic and Canadian oil production. But with the increased traffic have come major crashes and explosions, like one in 2013 in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec, that killed 47, one in 2013 in North Dakota and one in Oregon in 2016.

The rule was mainly meant to implement a new design for tank cars that carry crude, with new requirements for metal thickness and fire protection. The brake mandate and speed limits were also in the new regulation.

The brake requirement was a top target for the railroad and oil industries in pushing back against parts of the 2015 rule.

Congress, in the bipartisan Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act of 2016, told the PHMSA to conduct a new cost-benefit analysis of the brake provision. If the costs outweighed the benefits, the PHMSA was required to repeal it.

"Despite the additional testing and modeling, we still believe that there is insufficient data demonstrating that ECP braking systems provide a demonstrable increase in safety over other more widely used braking systems," the American Petroleum Institute told the PHMSA after it proposed Monday's action in December.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on February 3, 2023, a train with 38 cars derailed in East Palestine, Ohio, and the full devastating aftermath of that tragedy is ongoing. The affected community needs answers and change to make sure that something like this does not happen again.

The Trump administration rolled back train safety rules. Now, Republicans want to make it easier for polluters to pollute. They put a chemical industry lobbyist in charge of the EPA office in charge of chemical safety. I mean, you can't make this stuff up. They rolled back regulations on train brakes, and they reduced rail inspections.

I just want to say one thing to my colleague from Kentucky. I have no problem with releasing all the tapes, but that is not what happened. The Speaker of the House selectively and carefully released them to one person, to one news agency, who then deliberately cherry-picked things to advance a distortion of what happened that day, an insult to the people who work here, an insult to the Capitol Police officers who were injured that day. That is not transparency. That is propaganda. That is deliberately distorting a horrific event in which this Capitol was attacked, our democracy was attacked. So, please, give me a break.

Madam Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question, and if we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that affirms the House's unwavering commitment to protect and

strengthen Social Security and Medicare and states that it is the position of the House to reject any cuts in the program.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD along with any extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, Social Security and Medicare are the bedrocks of our Nation's social safety net. Yet, as my Republican colleagues demand reckless cuts in exchange for paying our Nation's bills, these programs are under threat.

Despite recent rhetoric to the contrary, Republicans claim that they won't cut Social Security and Medicare benefits. Well, Madam Speaker, today, Democrats are yet again giving Republicans another chance to back up that claim with action by providing them a chance to reassure the American people not just with their words, but with their votes. Today, they can vote unequivocally that they will not cut these vital programs. Anything short of that is an empty promise.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alaska (Mrs. PELTOLA), to discuss our proposal.

Mrs. PELTOLA. Madam Speaker, with enactment of the Social Security Act in 1935, this country promised Americans that if they worked hard and contributed to the program to support others, when they retire or become disabled or lose a spouse, they will be taken care of, too.

Social Security helps us provide for retirees but also disabled workers, widows and widowers, spouses, and children.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt claimed that Social Security would "promote the common welfare and the economic stability of the Nation," and it has.

Social Security has kept millions of seniors out of poverty and continues to do so. Today, Social Security provides monthly checks to more than 65 million beneficiaries who rely on it for food and other necessities.

For over 85 years now, trusting in the promise of Social Security, millions of Americans have worked hard, paying into the program out of every single paycheck for decades.

In 2019, Social Security had helped 31,146 Alaskans stay out of poverty. A report from a few years ago found that without Social Security the elderly poverty rate in Alaska would have increased from 7.6 percent to 28 percent. As of 2021, over 110,000 Alaskans were receiving monthly Social Security benefits, including 84,796 who are 65 and older. In total, that is over 13 percent of Alaskan residents.

I was raised, as I think many others were, with the value of treating elders with great deference and respect, to

care for them as they have cared for us. I can think of no better way to do that than to ensure that they have a safe and secure retirement. Simply, this program reflects our values. All Americans deserve to retire with dignity.

We must support our senior citizens by strengthening Social Security and not slashing it. We need to protect and expand Social Security.

Despite the many demonstrated successes of the Social Security program, there have been no benefit increases to the program in over 50 years. I hear from many Alaskans back home who are scared that they will not receive the Social Security benefits they have worked so hard for all their lives.

Alaskans worry that the checks they depend on will suddenly disappear, and they have no plan B. They count on receiving this earned benefit that they rely on to pay for essentials like heating. My own monthly heating bill in my hometown of Bethel, Alaska, is over \$1,000 a month, and my understanding is that is a low bill.

People do not deserve to live with this kind of uncertainty and insecurity. That is why safeguarding and reforming Social Security must be a priority for this Congress.

Social Security was a solemn promise made to Americans by its government in full faith and credit. I commit to protecting this promise for Alaska and all Americans and implore my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY).

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, which provides consideration for three important pieces of legislation to restore trust and certainty for millions of Americans.

Specifically, I will highlight H.J. Res. 27, which would provide for congressional disapproval of the Biden administration's overreaching new Waters of the United States, or WOTUS, rule that threatens the livelihoods and survival of our Nation's farmers and rural communities.

The Biden EPA's new reinterpretation of WOTUS is a complete rejection of the Clean Water Act's decades-long, broadly accepted jurisdiction. The new rule gives the Federal Government sweeping authority over private lands and unleashes the Federal regulatory machine on private property owners, over bodies of water as small as ditches, low spots, and ephemeral drainages. And God forbid, if a farmer is perceived to have violated the EPA's vague new WOTUS regulatory framework, they could find themselves tangled in years of expensive litigation and red tape threatening their very survival as an operation.

Now, my district in western New York, in the Southern Tier, has over 800 dairy operations. These are generational farms with deep roots in our surrounding communities. My farmers, as in the case with farmers across this

country, are deeply worried about how the Biden EPA's new WOTUS rule will impact the long-term survival of their operations.

Our farmers should be focused on production and growing and maintaining their operations, not hiring outside, expensive consultants to help them navigate a maze of new burdensome government regulations. They shouldn't be worried about whether farming a certain part of their land will lead to thousands, hundreds of thousands, or even millions of dollars in penalties, enough to put these family farms out of business. But under the Biden administration, sadly, this is just considered the cost of doing business.

Now, some might say I am speaking in hyperbole. But we have seen this play out before in 2015. We saw what an overly broad interpretation of WOTUS meant to our farmers, many of whom suffered devastating fines from an overzealous Obama-era EPA for having the audacity to manage and farm their own private lands.

So the question before us with this resolution isn't how to best regulate a pond versus a stream or a low spot. It isn't how far we should turn the dial up on regulation, forward or backward, so as to not inflict too much pain on rural America. It is a question of whether we stand for the long-term survival of American agriculture and domestic food security or whether we are willing to regulate the American farmer out of business and out of existence.

Congress has a duty to review and oppose this radical interpretation of WOTUS. I strongly support the rule, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1300

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I don't want to be lectured about farms and our farmers. I represent a district with thousands of farms in it.

The bottom line is my farmers care about things like clean water. They care about the environment because they know that contaminated water can contaminate the food supply, among other things. My farmers are worried about climate change and the impact it is having on their ability to grow crops.

I don't want to be lectured about farms or what farmers want. I don't know of any farmer who wants to create a situation where polluters are basically not held accountable for the pollution they cause.

Think about what happened in East Palestine, Ohio. Is it the position of the Republicans that the railroad should not be required to pay for the damage that they have done, that the community should assume those costs, or the Federal Government? I don't know who should pay for it. The farmers should pay for that? Come on.

We can hear a lot about, "This does X, Y, and Z," when we know it is an exaggeration.

Putting that aside, I will say for the record that I represent a lot of farmers. I talk to my farmers all the time. I do farm tours every single year. What they talk to me about is making sure that we have a clean environment, that they have access to clean water, and that we actually start paying attention to climate change, which is destroying their ability to be profitable and to be able to thrive.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article in the New York Post titled: "10 myths told by COVID experts—and now debunked," by Marty Makary, a professor at Johns Hopkins School of Medicine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

[From the New York Post, Feb. 27, 2023]

10 MYTHS TOLD BY COVID EXPERTS—AND NOW DEBUNKED

(By Marty Makary)

In the past few weeks, a series of analyses published by highly respected researchers have exposed a truth about public health officials during COVID:

Much of the time, they were wrong.

To be clear, public health officials were not wrong for making recommendations based on what was known at the time.

That's understandable. You go with the data you have.

No, they were wrong because they refused to change their directives in the face of new evidence.

When a study did not support their policies, they dismissed it and censored opposing opinions.

At the same time, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention weaponized research itself by putting out its own flawed studies in its own non-peer-reviewed medical journal, MMWR.

In the final analysis, public health officials actively propagated misinformation that ruined lives and forever damaged public trust in the medical profession.

Here are 10 ways they misled Americans:

**MISINFORMATION #1: NATURAL IMMUNITY OFFERS LITTLE PROTECTION COMPARED TO VACCINATED IMMUNITY**

A Lancet study looked at 65 major studies in 19 countries on natural immunity. The researchers concluded that natural immunity was at least as effective as the primary COVID vaccine series.

Public health officials downplayed concerns about vaccine-induced myocarditis—or inflammation of the heart muscle.

In fact, the scientific data was there all along—from 160 studies, despite the findings of these studies violating Facebook's "misinformation" policy.

Since the Athenian plague of 430 BC, it has been observed that those who recovered after infection were protected against severe disease if reinfect.

That was also the observation of nearly every practicing physician during the first 18 months of the COVID pandemic.

Most Americans who were fired for not having the COVID vaccine already had antibodies that effectively neutralized the virus, but they were antibodies that the government did not recognize.

**MISINFORMATION #2: MASKS PREVENT COVID TRANSMISSION**

Cochran Reviews are considered the most authoritative and independent assessment of the evidence in medicine.

And one published last month by a highly respected Oxford research team found that masks had no significant impact on COVID transmission.

When asked about this definitive review, CDC Director Dr. Rochelle Walensky downplayed it, arguing that it was flawed because it focused on randomized controlled studies.

A study recently found that masks didn't have much of an effect on preventing COVID-19 transmission.

But that was the greatest strength of the review. Randomized studies are considered the gold standard of medical evidence.

If all the energy used by public health officials to mask toddlers could have been channeled to reduce child obesity by encouraging outdoor activities, we would be better off.

**MISINFORMATION #3: SCHOOL CLOSURES REDUCE COVID TRANSMISSION**

The CDC ignored the European experience of keeping schools open, most without mask mandates.

Transmission rates were no different, evidenced by studies conducted in Spain and Sweden.

**MISINFORMATION #4: MYOCARDITIS FROM THE VACCINE IS LESS COMMON THAN FROM THE INFECTION**

Public health officials downplayed concerns about vaccine-induced myocarditis—or inflammation of the heart muscle.

They cited poorly designed studies that under-captured complication rates. A flurry of well-designed studies said the opposite.

We now know that myocarditis is six to 28 times more common after the COVID vaccine than after the infection among 16- to 24-year-old males.

Tens of thousands of children likely got myocarditis, mostly subclinical, from a COVID vaccine they did not need because they were entirely healthy or because they already had COVID.

**MISINFORMATION #5: YOUNG PEOPLE BENEFIT FROM A VACCINE BOOSTER**

Boosters reduced hospitalizations in older, high-risk Americans.

But the evidence was never there that they lower COVID mortality in young, healthy people.

That's probably why the CDC chose not to publish its data on hospitalization rates among boosted Americans under 50, when it published the same rates for those over 50.

Ultimately, White House pressure to recommend boosters for all was so intense that the FDA's two top vaccine experts left the agency in protest, writing scathing articles on how the data did not support boosters for young people.

**MISINFORMATION #6: VACCINE MANDATES INCREASED VACCINATION RATES**

President Biden and other officials demanded that unvaccinated workers, regardless of their risk or natural immunity, be fired.

They demanded that soldiers be dishonorably discharged and nurses be laid off in the middle of a staffing crisis.

The mandate was based on the theory that vaccination reduced transmission rates—a notion later proven to be false.

But after the broad recognition that vaccination does not reduce transmission, the mandates persisted, and still do to this day.

A recent study from George Mason University details how vaccine mandates in nine major U.S. cities had no impact on vaccination rates.

They also had no impact on COVID transmission rates.

**MISINFORMATION #7: COVID ORIGINATING FROM THE WUHAN LAB IS A CONSPIRACY THEORY**

Google admitted to suppressing searches of "lab leak" during the pandemic.

Dr. Francis Collins, head of the National Institutes of Health, claimed (and still does) he didn't believe the virus came from a lab.

Ultimately, overwhelming circumstantial evidence points to a lab leak origin—the same origin suggested to Dr. Anthony Fauci by two very prominent virologists in a January 2020 meeting he assembled at the beginning of the pandemic.

According to documents obtained by Bret Baier of Fox News, they told Fauci and Collins that the virus may have been manipulated and originated in the lab, but then suddenly changed their tune in public comments days after meeting with the NIH officials.

The virologists were later awarded nearly \$9 million from Fauci's agency.

The theory that COVID-19 originated from a Chinese lab in Wuhan proved to be true.

**MISINFORMATION #8: IT WAS IMPORTANT TO GET THE SECOND VACCINE DOSE THREE OR FOUR WEEKS AFTER THE FIRST DOSE**

Data were clear in the spring of 2021, just months after the vaccine rollout, that spacing the vaccine out by three months reduces complication rates and increases immunity.

Spacing out vaccines would have also saved more lives when Americans were rationing a limited vaccine supply at the height of the epidemic.

**MISINFORMATION #9: DATA ON THE BIVALENT VACCINE IS 'CRYSTAL CLEAR'**

Dr. Ashish Jha famously said this, despite the bivalent vaccine being approved using data from eight mice.

To date, there has never been a randomized controlled trial of the bivalent vaccine. In my opinion, the data are crystal clear that young people should not get the bivalent vaccine.

It would have also spared many children myocarditis.

**MISINFORMATION #10: ONE IN FIVE PEOPLE GET LONG COVID**

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention claims that 20% of COVID infections can result in long COVID.

But a UK study found that only 3% of COVID patients had residual symptoms lasting 12 weeks. What explains the disparity?

It's often normal to experience mild fatigue or weakness for weeks after being sick and inactive and not eating well.

Calling these cases long COVID is the medicalization of ordinary life.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention claims that 20% of COVID infections can result in long COVID, but other studies say differently.

What's most amazing about all the misinformation conveyed by CDC and public health officials is that there have been no apologies for holding on to their recommendations for so long after the data became apparent that they were dead wrong.

Public health officials said "you must" when the correct answer should have been "we're not sure."

Early on, in the absence of good data, public health officials chose a path of stem paternalism.

Today, they are in denial of a mountain of strong studies showing that they were wrong.

At minimum, the CDC should come clean and the FDA should add a warning label to COVID vaccines, clearly stating what is now known.

A mea culpa by those who led us astray would be a first step to rebuilding trust.

Marty Makary MD, MPH is a professor at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine and author of "The Price We Pay."

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, in this article that I have just referenced, misinformation No. 7 was that "COVID originating from the Wuhan lab is a conspiracy theory." It is not. I think we are going to find that out when this resolution passes, and I expect a lot of Democrat support for the resolution. It passed by unanimous consent in the Senate.

"Google admitted to suppressing searches of 'lab leak' during the pandemic. Dr. Francis Collins, head of the National Institutes of Health, claimed, and still does, he didn't believe the virus came from a lab."

"Ultimately, overwhelming circumstantial evidence points to a lab leak origin, the same origin suggested to Dr. Anthony Fauci by two very prominent virologists in a January 2020 meeting he assembled at the beginning of the pandemic. According to documents obtained by Bret Baier of FOX News, they told Fauci and Collins that the virus may have been manipulated and originated in the lab, but then suddenly changed their tune in public comments days after meeting with the NIH officials. The virologists were later awarded nearly \$9 million from Fauci's agency."

Maybe this is why we are not getting the truth yet. We will get the truth if this rule passes and the subsequent S. 619 passes here in the House. I think it is very important.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I don't think there is any controversy over the bill to make as much of the classified report unclassified that is possible. There is no controversy over that.

I want to make sure that people understand who is responsible for actually doing the investigation. It was Joe Biden, not the previous President.

I want people to remember what the previous President said. On January 24, 2020, Donald Trump said: "China has been working very hard to contain the coronavirus. The United States greatly appreciates their efforts and transparency. It will all work out well. In particular, on behalf of the American people, I want to thank President Xi." Really?

On February 7, 2020, Trump said: "I just spoke to President Xi last night, and, you know, we are working on the problem, the virus. It is a very tough situation, but I think he is going to handle it. I think he has handled it really well. We are helping wherever we can."

On February 7, he said: "Just had a long and very good conversation by phone with President Xi of China. He is strong, sharp, and powerfully focused on leading the counterattack on the coronavirus. He feels they are doing

very well, even building hospitals in a matter of only days. . . . Great discipline is taking place in China, as President Xi strongly leads what will be a very successful operation. We are working closely with China to help."

Then he also said: "Late last night, I had a very good talk with President Xi, and we talked about—mostly about the coronavirus. They are working really hard, and I think they are doing a very professional job. They are in touch with the world organization—CDC also. We are working together, but World Health is working with them. CDC is working with them. I had a great conversation last night with President Xi. It is a tough situation. I think they are doing a very good job."

Then he said on February 10: "I think China is very, you know, professionally run, in the sense that they have everything under control," Trump said. "I really believe they are going to have it under control fairly soon. You know, in April, supposedly, it dies with the hotter weather, and that is a beautiful date to look forward to. But China, I can tell you, is working very hard."

On February 13: "I think they have handled it professionally, and I think they are extremely capable. And I think President Xi is extremely capable, and I hope that it is going to be resolved."

On February 23, President Trump said: "I think President Xi is working very, very hard. I spoke to him. He is working very hard. I think he is doing a very good job. It is a big problem, but President Xi loves his country. He is working very hard to solve the problem, and he will solve the problem. Okay?"

Then, on February 29, he said: "China seems to be making tremendous progress. Their numbers are way down. . . . I think our relationship with China is very good. We just did a big trade deal. We are starting on another trade deal with China, a very big one, and we have been working very closely. They have been talking to our people. We have been talking to their people, having to do with the virus."

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from Politico titled: "15 times Trump praised China as coronavirus was spreading across the globe."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Politico, Apr. 15, 2020]

15 TIMES TRUMP PRAISED CHINA AS CORONAVIRUS WAS SPREADING ACROSS THE GLOBE

(By Myah Ward)

The president has lambasted the WHO for accepting Beijing's assurances about the outbreak, but he repeated them, as well.

President Donald Trump yanked U.S. funding for the World Health Organization on Tuesday, complaining that the United Nations public health agency was overly deferential to China and had put too much faith in Beijing's assertions that it had the

coronavirus outbreak there was under control.

"Had the WHO done its job to get medical experts into China to objectively assess the situation on the ground and to call out China's lack of transparency, the outbreak could have been contained at its source with very little death," the president said Tuesday. "Instead, the W.H.O. willingly took China's assurances to face value."

Trump, however, echoed many of those same assurances regarding China and its response to the virus throughout January and February, as the unique coronavirus began to infiltrate countries around the world. Just days before the U.S. recorded its first death from Covid-19, Trump touted China's government for its transparency and hard work to defeat the coronavirus that causes the illness.

POLITICO has compiled a list of 15 times the president hailed China for its push to prevent a pandemic in the early months of 2020—an effort that ultimately failed:

Jan. 22, Twitter:

"One of the many great things about our just signed giant Trade Deal with China is that it will bring both the USA & China closer together in so many other ways. Terrific working with President Xi, a man who truly loves his country. Much more to come."

Jan. 24, Twitter:

"China has been working very hard to contain the Coronavirus. The United States greatly appreciates their efforts and transparency. It will all work out well. In particular, on behalf of the American People, I want to thank President Xi."

Jan. 29, Remarks at signing ceremony for the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement:

"And, honestly, I think, as tough as this negotiation was, I think our relationship with China now might be the best it's been in a long, long time. And now it's reciprocal. Before, we were being ripped off badly. Now we have a reciprocal relationship, maybe even better than reciprocal for us."

Jan. 30, Fox News interview:

"China is not in great shape right now, unfortunately. But they're working very hard. We'll see what happens. But we're working very closely with China and other countries."

Feb. 7, Remarks at North Carolina Opportunity Now Summit in Charlotte, N.C.:

"I just spoke to President Xi last night, and, you know, we're working on the—the problem, the virus. It's a—it's a very tough situation. But I think he's going to handle it. I think he's handled it really well. We're helping wherever we can."

Feb. 7, Twitter:

"Just had a long and very good conversation by phone with President Xi of China. He is strong, sharp and powerfully focused on leading the counterattack on the Coronavirus. He feels they are doing very well, even building hospitals in a matter of only days. . . . Great discipline is taking place in China, as President Xi strongly leads what will be a very successful operation. We are working closely with China to help."

Feb. 7, Remarks before Marine One departure:

"Late last night, I had a very good talk with President Xi, and we talked about—mostly about the coronavirus. They're working really hard, and I think they are doing a very professional job. They're in touch with World—the World—World Organization. CDC also. We're working together. But World Health is working with them. CDC is working with them. I had a great conversation last night with President Xi. It's a tough situation. I think they're doing a very good job."



Feb. 10, Fox Business interview:

"I think China is very, you know, professionally run in the sense that they have everything under control," Trump said. "I really believe they are going to have it under control fairly soon. You know in April, supposedly, it dies with the hotter weather. And that's a beautiful date to look forward to. But China I can tell you is working very hard."

Feb. 10, campaign rally in Manchester, N.H.:

"I spoke with President Xi, and they're working very, very hard. And I think it's all going to work out fine."

Feb. 13, Fox News interview:

"I think they've handled it professionally and I think they're extremely capable and I think President Xi is extremely capable and I hope that it's going to be resolved."

Feb. 18, remarks before Air Force One departure:

"I think President Xi is working very hard. As you know, I spoke with him recently. He's working really hard. It's a tough problem. I think he's going to do—look, I've seen them build hospitals in a short period of time. I really believe he wants to get that done, and he wants to get it done fast. Yes, I think he's doing it very professionally."

Feb. 23, remarks before Marine One departure:

"I think President Xi is working very, very hard. I spoke to him. He's working very hard. I think he's doing a very good job. It's a big problem. But President Xi loves his country. He's working very hard to solve the problem, and he will solve the problem. OK?"

Feb. 26, remarks at a business roundtable in New Delhi, India:

"China is working very, very hard. I have spoken to President Xi, and they're working very hard. And if you know anything about him, I think he'll be in pretty good shape. They're—they've had a rough patch, and I think right now they have it—it looks like they're getting it under control more and more. They're getting it more and more under control."

Feb. 27, Coronavirus Task Force press conference:

"I spoke with President Xi. We had a great talk. He's working very hard, I have to say. He's working very, very hard. And if you can count on the reports coming out of China, that spread has gone down quite a bit. The infection seems to have gone down over the last two days. As opposed to getting larger, it's actually gotten smaller."

Feb. 29, Coronavirus Task Force press conference:

"China seems to be making tremendous progress. Their numbers are way down. . . . I think our relationship with China is very good. We just did a big trade deal. We're starting on another trade deal with China—a very big one. And we've been working very closely. They've been talking to our people, we've been talking to their people, having to do with the virus."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I remind my Republican colleagues that the leader of their own party repeatedly applauded China during the peak of the pandemic.

The bottom line is that we should all be grateful that we have a President now that has actually launched an investigation to get to the bottom of this.

Today, hopefully, we will, in a bipartisan way, vote to make as much of that investigation declassified as possible.

Let's not forget the history here. Let's not forget who was praising Chi-

na's reaction to the coronavirus because I think it is important that we keep that in mind, especially listening to some of the rhetoric coming from the other side.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, although it is not the subject of today's resolution or any of the bills covered by this resolution, the Democrats just can't avoid talking about the release of the January 6 videos. They keep going back to it during this debate.

Madam Speaker, I would remind them that 78 percent of Democrats out in America support the release of all of these videos.

The fact that they are apoplectic about the few minutes of video that Tucker Carlson released on Monday shows that Tucker Carlson is over the target. For 2 years, they have been selectively releasing information and videos to set a narrative. In just a few minutes, the entire narrative was challenged—might I say it collapsed under the scrutiny, under the review of just a few minutes of undoctored video that came from this body.

I applaud Tucker Carlson for releasing that. The American people are right. If the Democrats are so upset that only a few of these videos were released, I would remind them that they were able to release these at any point in the past.

Moving on to something that is the subject of this resolution, I want to talk about the repeal of Joe Biden's 2023 WOTUS ruling, the waters of the U.S. ruling. Like I said before, it is "Groundhog Day" again.

Under President Bush, we had one set of rules that farmers, homebuilders, and landowners came to understand. They were a little hard to comply with because every division of the Army Corps of Engineers might interpret them differently, or different States would interpret them differently, or different bureaucrats at the EPA would interpret them differently.

Then, Obama came along with a rule to expand the definition of waters of the U.S., and then Trump came into office and the rules changed again. Now, Biden is here trying, once again, to change the rules on what are the waters of the U.S.

The farmers and homebuilders I talk to don't say they don't want any regulations. Nobody in this body has said no regulation is what we want.

The question is, give us clear, precise, understandable regulations we can follow that do not change. Frankly, those should be written by Congress. They shouldn't be made up by every administration that comes into power. Yet, that is what we are doing, or that is what has happened.

Today, we are talking about repealing those onerous changes and unclear changes. For instance, Susan Bodine testified in front of the Transportation

and Infrastructure Committee this year on this topic, and she talked about the significant nexus test that they apply in WOTUS 2023, waters of the U.S. To support expanded jurisdiction under this rule, the agencies now claim that isolated water can affect the biological integrity of navigable water.

What does that mean? If you have a puddle of water that a bird lands in and drinks from and takes some seeds or some larvae, and when it drinks and flies to a river and deposits it in its bird droppings, or maybe as it flies over the river and it doesn't even visit the river, if there is any kind of biological connection—and as we have found, everything is biologically connected on this planet. If there is any biological connection that they can establish between a puddle of water on your property and a navigable water, then they say, this is now covered under waters of the U.S. This is ridiculous.

The only certainty that our farmers and our landowners are going to get from Biden's 2023 WOTUS rule is the certainty that if a raindrop has fallen on your property, a government agent will show up someday and tell you what you can and can't do with that property under this rule.

That is why it is important for us to repeal that, and that is why this resolution is so important.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this is the second time the gentleman has said that all the tapes of what happened on January 6 were released. Maybe he can tell us where the general public can find them. How do they get access to them?

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I said that the other side could have released them.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman said that all the tapes had been released. The only person who got the tapes was a political hack at FOX News who used them to distort the reality and the truth and to insult the service of the people who work up here, including our Capitol Police officers.

I am for releasing as much as can be released so long as it doesn't violate any security protocols. Let's listen to what the U.S. Capitol Police chief said in response to Tucker Carlson's coverage of January 6. He said: "Last night, an opinion program aired commentary that was filled with offensive and misleading conclusions about the January 6 attack. The opinion program never reached out to the department to provide accurate context."

"One false allegation is that our officers helped the rioters and acted as



'tour guides.' This is outrageous and false. The department stands by the officers in the video that was shown last night. I don't have to remind you how outnumbered our officers were on January 6. Those officers did their best to use deescalation tactics to try to talk rioters into getting each other to leave the building.

"The program conveniently cherry-picked from the calmer moments of our 41,000 hours of video. The commentary fails to provide context about the chaos and violence that happened before or during these less tense moments.

"Finally, the most disturbing accusation from last night was that our late friend and colleague Brian Sicknick's death had nothing to do with his heroic actions on January 6. The department maintains, as anyone with common sense would, that had Officer Sicknick not fought valiantly for hours on the day he was violently assaulted, Officer Sicknick would not have died the next day.

"As some people select from 41,000 hours of video clips that seemingly support the narrative they want to push, those of you who were here on January 6, those of you who were in the fight, those of you who ensured that no Member of Congress was hurt, those of you who contributed to the effort to allow this country's legislative process to continue know firsthand what actually happened."

I would just simply say, Madam Speaker, if we want to make sure that we do not see another January 6 ever again occur in our country's future, then we all ought to speak with one voice, condemn what happened that day, and characterize it for what it was: an attack on our democracy.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I surely didn't expect this to turn into a debate on the January 6 videotapes or to hear the Democrats propose that it sounds like they are in favor of all of the tapes being released instead of just some of them.

I think if the gentleman would review the transcript, and I could be wrong, but I think he will find out that I said Tucker Carlson only released a few minutes of that, and those few minutes were able to destroy the narrative that had been constructed over 2 years.

But if the gentleman cares to answer a question, then maybe we have come to some bipartisan agreement that all of the tapes should be released.

Madam Speaker, I would ask if the gentleman when he speaks next if he would speak to that topic and if he would be in favor of releasing all of the tapes instead of releasing them partially.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, when the gentleman says that what Tucker Carlson aired somehow destroyed the narrative, I mean, give me a break, he is essentially basically saying what happened on January 6 conforms with what Tucker Carlson said. It is offensive to everybody who was here that day. It is offensive to the staff, and it is offensive to the Capitol Police officers. It is offensive to everybody.

Madam Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman that what I said before was that I favored releasing tapes so long as they did not—it is my personal opinion—so long as they do not at all compromise any security. That is what I said.

But it is so sad to be on this House floor after what happened on that day and to hear Members of Congress basically try to cover up the horrendous atrocity that occurred that day, the attack on our democracy. It is shameful.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, what is just as revealing as what we are debating this week is what we are not talking about.

We are now 3 months into the Republican majority. They haven't passed a single bill into law yet, and, in fact, rather than debating things that people care about, we are spending week after week passing bills that are designed to get Facebook likes and retweets instead of making an actual difference with the people back home.

Three out of four Americans say that the Republicans in Congress do not have the right agenda.

Madam Speaker, if you want proof that they are right, then look no further than what so much of today's debate was focused on.

Democrats passed bills to bring jobs back from China and take on Putin's war of aggression. Republicans are passing bills to make it easier for Russia and China to spread their propaganda here in the United States.

Democrats passed laws holding polluters accountable, took action to get rid of lead pipes and clean up our rivers and lakes. Republicans are passing bills to protect the polluters that dump toxic chemicals into our water.

The American people expect more. They expect us to pass bills that actually matter to our families. Democrats have been putting people over politics to do it. We get stuff done while Republicans are chasing down the approval of the hyper online far right that spends

all their time on Twitter trying to own the libs.

So that is why I am asking my colleagues to join me in defeating the previous question so we can get this House on record as saying that we are going to protect Social Security and Medicare.

Finally, Madam Speaker, again, the idea that the leadership on the Republican side was complicit with FOX News and with Tucker Carlson to spread lies and distortions about what happened on January 6 and to insult the service of the brave men and women who protect this building and all of us who are in it is unconscionable.

It would be so refreshing for Republicans to join us in condemning the distortions that were on FOX News. It is stunning to me that we can't get any of them to condemn. Some of them—their Senate counterparts—did, and I praise them for it. But the silence here is deafening, and it is offensive. It is offensive.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, it is somewhat serendipitous, but in the context of this debate on a rule about other bills, it seems we have come to some agreement, it appears to me, with the American people, 81 percent of whom believe that all of the tapes should be released. It seems as if we have come to some agreement that we all would be better off if we get to the bottom of the truth and all of the truth comes out and all of the tapes come out so that no one side can distort what actually happened that day, and then let the American people decide.

So in the interest of transparency and in the interest of getting back to the subject matter at hand, which are three bills covered by this rule, I want to talk about S. 619, which is so important. It is transparency, and it is the transparency that the American people deserve. It passed by unanimous consent in the Senate. Even though it seems like there is some opposition on the other side, I suspect we are going to get a lot of votes from Democrats on S. 619.

I think it is important to go on the record for elected Representatives to say whether or not they believe their constituents are entitled to the truth which our government possesses or at least information that they possess that would help somebody come to a conclusion of what the origins of this virus were and did they come from Wuhan.

The President could do this at any time. He could have done it at any time in the past 2 years. He hasn't done it. It is time to put him on the spot and say: You either veto this or you release that information that you have withheld from the American public for 2 years, which is too long. I suspect we could overcome his veto.

Next, Madam Speaker, I want to talk about the Waters of the U.S. rule.

Why is this timely?

Because on March 20 this goes into effect. That is why it is so urgent to repeal the 2023 Waters of the U.S. rule.

These are laws.

Were they written by lawmakers?

No. Our Founding Fathers created three branches of government. We have the executive branch which enforces laws, we have the judicial branch which resolves disputes, and we have the legislative branch which is supposed to make the laws. Yet, here we sit abdicating that authority and that responsibility. You can delegate authority, but you can't delegate responsibility, Madam Speaker.

We have a responsibility to the American people to make sure that these laws are concise, that they don't change on the whim of an executive who gets in the White House, that they are not onerous, that they have their intended effect, and that they are applied uniformly across the country.

Yet we have abdicated that responsibility. But we will take that responsibility back by the passage of this rule and the subsequent legislation to repeal the WOTUS, Waters of the United States 2023, by Joe Biden. We, the American people, deserve that.

Finally, I will close by talking about H.R. 140. This is a bill that went through regular order. What a wonderful thing. We have talked about it so much. It is a bill that covers one topic only. We have talked about that so much. Here we are, and we even have a chance—even though it was amended in the committee—to amend it here on the floor to perfect it even more for Members and by Members who aren't members of that committee.

Are these amendments that are not germane?

Are these the kind of amendments that the American people hate where Members offer an amendment and then they stick something into a bill that is completely unrelated to it?

No. Every one of these amendments is germane to this bill. We have made sure of that in the Rules Committee. The gentleman serves on the Rules Committee, and he had plenty of time to voice his concerns there.

So we have a lot of amendments that are great. I think they will improve the bill. But what is most important is that people have a chance to have their point made and to get a vote on this.

Finally, I will talk about what H.R. 140 would fix. It would fix this loophole that they think they have constructed that allows the Federal Government to violate the Constitution.

Obviously, Federal agents can't take away our First Amendment rights, and, obviously, the Constitution wasn't meant to bind social media companies. It was meant to bind the administration.

What we have is a loophole where the administration leans on a social media company that they are paying money

to. Millions of dollars have gone to these social media companies from the CDC and from the FBI.

So when they say:

Would you pretty please ban this user?

Or:

Would you pretty please take down these posts? There is a whole series of these posts.

The government doesn't get in line. They have a back door that they can trot to every day and submit lists of people whom they think should be banned because they don't like what they have said.

This is dangerous to our Republic. If the other side wants to call it a democracy, then it is dangerous to the democracy. But this is a republic.

Our government has built an elaborate but constitutionally unsound framework for violating these natural rights.

As we have seen with the Twitter files, they boldly work in close cooperation with private-sector actors who aren't subject to constitutional restrictions imposed on government by our Founders.

But they also claim foreign influence and national security so they can target U.S. citizens with agencies in the government under the military chain of command whose missions are ostensibly directed at foreign actors who have no constitutional rights.

Elected lawmakers be damned, legions of government lawyers create shaky legal scaffolding and ad hoc doctrine to indemnify the actors within our government who eagerly exploit these loopholes.

In this way, government actors can claim everything they do is legal. They have a bunch of lawyers to back them:

Oh, we didn't do anything illegal, it is all legal. Here, look at our doctrine. The lawyers have gone through it, it is all legal.

Here is the problem, Madam Speaker: much of what they do is unconstitutional.

So whose job is it to resolve that difference?

It is actually not the Supreme Court's job. We are entrusted with oversight. We all here swore an oath to the Constitution, and if we know that authorizations that we have made or that funding that we have appropriated has been twisted in a way to get around the Constitution or to drive through a loophole that some lawyers in the administrative branch have created, then it is our obligation—we owe it to the American people, we swore an oath to the Constitution—to fix that—not to make them go to court to get some remedy—but to fix it, to stop it in its tracks.

H.R. 140 with its pending amendments is a good down payment on that promise to the American people.

Madam Speaker, I support this rule, I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

The material previously referred to by Mr. McGOVERN is as follows:

#### AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 199

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 178) affirming the House of Representatives' commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 178.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 205, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

#### YEAS—217

Aderholt	DesJarlais	Hill
Alford	Diaz-Balart	Hinson
Allen	Donalds	Houchin
Amodei	Duarte	Hudson
Armstrong	Duncan	Huizenga
Arrington	Dunn (FL)	Hunt
Babin	Edwards	Issa
Bacon	Ellzey	Jackson (TX)
Baird	Emmer	James
Balderson	Estes	Johnson (LA)
Banks	Ezell	Johnson (OH)
Barr	Fallon	Johnson (SD)
Bean (FL)	Feenstra	Jordan
Bentz	Ferguson	Joyce (OH)
Bergman	Finstad	Joyce (PA)
Bice	Fischbach	Kean (NJ)
Biggs	Fitzgerald	Kelly (MS)
Bilirakis	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (PA)
Bishop (NC)	Fleischmann	Kiggans (VA)
Bost	Flood	Kiley
Brecheen	Foxx	Kim (CA)
Buchanan	Franklin, C.	Kustoff
Buck	Scott	LaHood
Bucshon	Fry	LaLota
Burchett	Fulcher	LaMalfa
Burgess	Gaetz	Lamborn
Burlison	Gallagher	Langworthy
Calvert	Garbarino	Latta
Cammack	Garcia, Mike	LaTurner
Carey	Gimenez	Lawler
Carl	Gonzales, Tony	Lee (FL)
Carter (GA)	Good (VA)	Lesko
Carter (TX)	Gooden (TX)	Letlow
Chavez-DeRemer	Gosar	Loudermilk
Ciscomani	Granger	Lucas
Cline	Graves (LA)	Luetkemeyer
Cloud	Graves (MO)	Luna
Clyde	Green (TN)	Luttrell
Cole	Greene (GA)	Mace
Collins	Griffith	Malliotakis
Comer	Grothman	Mann
Crane	Guest	Massie
Crawford	Guthrie	Mast
Crenshaw	Hageman	McCauley
Curtis	Harris	McClain
D'Esposito	Harshbarger	McClintock
Davidson	Hern	McCormick
De La Cruz	Higgins (LA)	McHenry

Meuser  
Miller (IL)  
Miller (OH)  
Miller (WV)  
Miller-Meeks  
Mills  
Molinaro  
Moolenaar  
Mooney  
Moore (AL)  
Moore (UT)  
Moran  
Murphy  
Nehls  
Newhouse  
Norman  
Nunn (IA)  
Obernolte  
Ogles  
Owens  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Posey

Reschenthaler  
Rodgers (WA)  
Rodgers (AL)  
Rodgers (KY)  
Rose  
Rosendale  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Salazar  
Santos  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Self  
Sessions  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spartz  
Stauber  
Steel  
Stefanik

Steil  
Stewart  
Strong  
Tenney  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Turner  
Valadao  
Van Drew  
Van Dyne  
Van Orden  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Waltz  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams (NY)  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym  
Zinke

Boebert  
Castro (TX)  
Cleaver  
Hoyer

NOT VOTING—12  
Leger Fernandez  
Lieu  
Phillips  
Schrier

Steube  
Thompson (PA)  
Weber (TX)  
Wilson (FL)

Miller-Meeks  
Mills  
Molinaro  
Moolenaar  
Mooney  
Moore (AL)  
Moore (UT)  
Moran  
Murphy  
Nehls  
Newhouse  
Norman  
Nunn (IA)  
Obernolte  
Ogles  
Owens  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Posey  
Reschenthaler  
Rodgers (WA)  
Rodgers (AL)

Rogers (KY)  
Rose  
Rosendale  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Santos  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Self  
Sessions  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spartz  
Stauber  
Steel  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Stewart  
Strong

Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Turner  
Valadao  
Van Drew  
Van Dyne  
Van Orden  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Waltz  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams (NY)  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym  
Zinke

## NAYS—205

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
Auchincloss  
Balint  
Barragán  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bowman  
Boyle (PA)  
Brown  
Brownley  
Budzinski  
Bush  
Caraveo  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson  
Carter (LA)  
Cartwright  
Casar  
Case  
Casten  
Castor (FL)  
Cherfilus-  
McCormick  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Craig  
Crockett  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Davids (KS)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (NC)  
Dean (PA)  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deluzio  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Español  
Evans  
Fletcher  
Foster  
Foushee  
Frankel, Lois  
Frost  
Gallo  
Garamendi  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)  
Garcia, Robert

Golden (ME)  
Goldman (NY)  
Gomez  
Gonzalez,  
Vicente  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al (TX)  
Grijalva  
Harder (CA)  
Hayes  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Horsford  
Houlahan  
Hoyle (OR)  
Huffman  
Ivey  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson (NC)  
Jackson Lee  
Jacobs  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Kamlager-Dove  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim (NJ)  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster  
Landsman  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Lee (PA)  
Levin  
Lofgren  
Lynch  
Magaziner  
Manning  
Matsui  
McBath  
McClellan  
McCollum  
McGarvey  
McGovern  
Meeks  
Menendez  
Meng  
Mfume  
Moore (WI)  
Moore (NY)  
Morelle  
Moskowitz  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Mullin  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Nickel  
Norcross  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone

Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peltola  
Perez  
Peters  
Pettersen  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Quigley  
Ramirez  
Raskin  
Ross  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan  
Salinas  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Scholten  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Sorensen  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Strickland  
Swalwell  
Sykes  
Takano  
Thanedar  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tokuda  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Vargas  
Vasquez  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams (GA)

Messrs.  
KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. SALINAS,  
WILD, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina,  
Mses. BROWN, and WATERS changed  
their vote from “yea” to “nay.”  
Messrs. POSEY, GARBARINO, and  
BANKS changed their vote from “nay”  
to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

Stated for:  
Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam  
Speaker, had I been present, I would have  
voted “yea” on rollcall No. 134.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The  
question is on the adoption of the reso-  
lution, as amended.

The question was taken; and the  
Speaker pro tempore announced that  
the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. On that, I demand a  
recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a  
5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 216, noes 206,  
not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

## AYES—216

Aderholt  
Alford  
Allen  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bean (FL)  
Bentz  
Bergman  
Bice  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NC)  
Boebert  
Bost  
Brecheen  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Burlison  
Calvert  
Cammack  
Carey  
Carl  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chavez-DeRemer  
Ciscomani  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cole  
Collins  
Comer  
Crane  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
D'Esposito  
Davidson  
De La Cruz

DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duarte  
Duncan  
Dunn (FL)  
Edwards  
Ellzey  
Emmer  
Ezell  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Finstad  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flood  
Foord  
Franklin, C.  
Scott  
Fry  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garbarino  
Garcia, Mike  
Gimenez  
Gonzales, Tony  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hageman  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hern  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Hinson

Houchin  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hunt  
Issa  
Jackson (TX)  
James  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Kean (NJ)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kiggans (VA)  
Kim (CA)  
Kustoff  
LaHood  
LaLota  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Langworthy  
Latta  
LaTurner  
Lawler  
Lee (FL)  
Lesko  
Letlow  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Luna  
Luttrell  
Mace  
Malliotakis  
Mann  
Massie  
Mast  
McCaull  
McClain  
McClintock  
McCormick  
McHenry  
Meuser  
Miller (IL)  
Miller (OH)  
Miller (WV)

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
Auchincloss  
Balint  
Barragán  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bowman  
Boyle (PA)  
Brown  
Brownley  
Budzinski  
Bush  
Caraveo  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson  
Carter (LA)  
Cartwright  
Casar  
Case  
Casten  
Castor (FL)  
Cherfilus-  
McCormick  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Craig  
Crockett  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Davids (KS)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (NC)  
Dean (PA)  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deluzio  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Español  
Evans  
Fletcher  
Foster  
Foushee  
Frankel, Lois  
Frost  
Gallo  
Garamendi  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)  
Garcia, Robert

## NOES—206

Golden (ME)  
Goldman (NY)  
Gomez  
Gonzalez,  
Vicente  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al (TX)  
Grijalva  
Harder (CA)  
Hayes  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Horsford  
Houlahan  
Hoyle (OR)  
Huffman  
Ivey  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson (NC)  
Jackson Lee  
Jacobs  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Kamlager-Dove  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim (NJ)  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster  
Landsman  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Lee (PA)  
Levin  
Lofgren  
Lynch  
Magaziner  
Manning  
Matsui  
McBath  
McClellan  
McCollum  
McGarvey  
McGovern  
Meeks  
Menendez  
Meng  
Mfume  
Moore (WI)  
Moore (NY)  
Morelle  
Moskowitz  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Mullin  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Nickel  
Norcross  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone

Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peltola  
Perez  
Peters  
Pettersen  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Quigley  
Ramirez  
Raskin  
Ross  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan  
Salinas  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Scholten  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Sorensen  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Strickland  
Swalwell  
Sykes  
Takano  
Thanedar  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tokuda  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Vargas  
Vasquez  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)

## NOT VOTING—12

Castro (TX)	Kiley	Salazar
Cleaver	Leger Fernandez	Schrier
Estes	Lieu	Steube
Hoyer	Phillips	Weber (TX)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1402

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I was not present for rollcall No. 135, on agreeing to the resolution, as amended. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

## SYRIA WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Syria and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLOOD). Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the concurrent resolution is considered as read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

## H. CON. RES. 21

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)), Congress directs the President to remove the United States Armed Forces from Syria by not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided among and controlled by Representative MCCAUL of Texas, Representative MEEKS of New York, and Representative GAETZ of Florida, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), each will control 20 minutes.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is not at war with Syria. Rather, the United States is conducting limited but im-

portant counterterrorism operations in Syria against ISIS, formerly known as al-Qaida in Iraq, pursuant to the 2001 counterterrorism AUMF.

Those operations are being reported regularly to Congress, consistent with the War Powers Resolution. They are not new or unique to the Biden administration.

In fact, let me quote President Trump about what we are doing here when he said: "A small presence of United States Armed Forces remains in strategically significant locations in Syria to conduct operations . . . to address continuing terrorist threats emanating from Syria."

"These ongoing operations, which the United States has carried out with the assistance of numerous international partners, have been successful in seriously degrading ISIS capabilities in Syria and Iraq."

When ISIS was at the peak of its power in 2015, it controlled vast territory in Iraq and Syria, which it used to launch attacks in the Middle East and beyond. Those terrorists ruled with medieval brutality. We all remember the graphic videos of ISIS fighters beheading journalists and innocent civilians.

These monsters drew thousands of volunteers to join their ranks in Iraq and Syria and inspired terrorist attacks around the world.

Our U.S. military, working with a global coalition and local forces on the ground, helped to dismantle and destroy this vicious caliphate.

I am proud that our men and women in uniform answered the call to fight this menace, which threatened the United States and the world.

Even though ISIS no longer controls significant territory, there are still tens of thousands of hardened terrorist fighters in Iraq and Syria who are hell-bent on reestablishing their terror state.

In fact, in the last quarter of 2022, ISIS claimed 72 attacks in Iraq and Syria, including several IED attacks.

Thankfully, our small deployment of U.S. servicemembers is remarkably effective at working with local partner forces to achieve results and ensure the enduring and complete defeat of ISIS. Otherwise, these numbers would be much worse.

In 2022, we were involved in 108 partner and 14 unilateral operations, killing 466 ISIS operatives and detaining 215 others.

None of us want our soldiers overseas and in harm's way any longer than is absolutely necessary. I understand that the gentleman from Florida has introduced this resolution in good faith and is well intentioned, and he did it in response to a February 17 operation to kill an ISIS leader, in which four U.S. servicemembers were wounded.

Any injured or killed servicemember is a tragedy. We are eternally grateful for the sacrifice made by our men and women in uniform and their families and never take them for granted.

It is our responsibility as Members of Congress to reassess, on an ongoing basis, whether their deployments and the risk they involve are necessary. In doing that, we must recall President Obama's disastrous decision to prematurely withdraw our troops from Iraq in 2011.

A few short years later, American troops returned to fight the deadly ISIS caliphate, which grew out of the al-Qaida presence that had not been defeated.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Milley, was in Syria just days ago to see our troops and assess the state of our mission. He went there to figure out what value this mission holds for our security. He said: "Unless you support and devote the correct amount of resources to it, things will get worse," and, "If you completely ignore and turn your back, then you are setting the conditions for a resurgence."

That is why I strongly oppose this resolution directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from Syria, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1415

If we withdraw our troops from Syria now, we could see a resurgence of ISIS or another lethal successor in a short time. Withdrawal of this legal, authorized U.S. troop deployment must be based on the total defeat of ISIS.

Let me be clear: Congress' power to declare war is one of our most solemn Article I responsibilities. I understand why some in this Chamber are uncomfortable with using a 22-year-old force authorization for current operations.

I believe that we should be working together, in a bipartisan manner, to have an updated replacement to this AUMF to address the current threat environment, while also keeping Congress engaged with our constitutional responsibilities.

But this resolution does not work to that end. I believe it would call for an artificial withdrawal and it would be a win for the ISIS terrorists committed to our destruction.

The bottom line is: The premise upon this resolution—as the Parliamentarian doesn't make fact-based determinations—the premise of this whole thing is that there is no authorization for troops to be in Syria today. It is just not accurate. In fact, it is wrong. In 2014, the ISIS threat was addressed under the Presidential authority of the 2001 AUMF.

I remember being in the White House with President Trump addressing this crisis, as well, about what to do about Syria, and whether we believe our U.S. troops should remain, in a very small footprint of 900 soldiers, in Syria.

At that time, President Trump made the decision that, under the 2001 AUMF, to keep these troops in country, and I believe that was the correct decision, and I stand by that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in this opposition, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 21.

Mr. Speaker, though I oppose an indefinite U.S. military presence in Syria, this measure forces a premature end to our mission at a critical time for our efforts. Forcing such a premature removal of U.S. forces not only endangers our national security, it threatens that of our allies and partners across the region and beyond and, most of all, the Syrian Kurds.

Our very small footprint in northeast Syria, alongside our courageous Syrian Kurdish partners, continues to serve a valuable purpose as we partner with them in ensuring ISIS does not reconstitute and again destabilize the region or use Syria as a base for attacks elsewhere.

We have seen how ISIS has wrought its brutality, not only on the populations of Syria and Iraq, especially against ethnic minority groups, but also launched brutal attacks, such as those in Paris, Brussels, Istanbul, and beyond.

Our military and intelligence leaders continue to warn publicly about the potential for ISIS to resurge if they are given the opportunity, including Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Mark Milley, who, just last week, made a public visit to northeast Syria. He highlighted the importance of finishing the job against ISIS and emphasized, if we ignore and turn our back, then we are setting the conditions for a resurgence.

Our presence also serves a critical advisory and assist role as the SDF continues to administer ISIS detainee facilities, including those holding experienced, highly trained ISIS fighters, as the United States, along with our coalition partners, works to safely and humanely repatriate them to their countries of origin. Pulling the plug now on this important mission jeopardizes the important work and support role that we play.

Finally, while I share the passion of the cosponsor of this legislation for Congress reclaiming its war powers, I do not think this concurrent resolution is the proper vehicle for doing so.

Last Congress, under my leadership, the House Foreign Affairs Committee marked up repeals of three of the four existing AUMFs that are on the books. The full House passed each of these measures as well but, unfortunately, they languished on the other side of the Capitol.

We need to continue this work, and I look forward to working with Chairman McCaul and the gentleman from Florida on these efforts. Congress must repeal outdated war authorizations once and for all, and I applaud the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for their bipartisan vote to repeal the 2002 and the 1991 AUMFs earlier today.

So we have important work to do. We should define hostilities in statute, not because it is an easy fix, but because it

is a hard question that underpins key national security issues around the globe.

Toughest of all, we must repeal the 2001 AUMF and replace it with a narrow force authorization that grants the President authority to combat select terrorists enumerated in countries where the United States' national security is at stake. I intend to introduce such an AUMF later this year.

I believe that the importance of combating ISIS in Syria should be on such an authorization, and this is part of why I oppose H. Con. Res. 21.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, most Americans don't know a single Syrian, and so people watching this debate might wonder, how has it come to be that Syria has become the great platform of great power competition in the world?

It begins in 2011, during the Arab Spring, when Assad, who is undeniably a madman and a despot, opens fire on his own people protesting. Then part of the Syrian Army defects; they engage in warfare against Assad, and all of a sudden, they have a whole lot of weapons and money being sent from the rich gulf monarchies, through Jordan, into Syria.

So Iran is not just going to watch this. Assad is their ally. They activate Hezbollah, they then invade Syria. So now you have Jordan, the gulf monarchies, Iran.

But wait, Russia is pitching their vision of the world as a regime preservation force, whether you are Maduro or Assad. So they get involved.

What do they get for their time?

A warm-water port in the Eastern Mediterranean.

So we have got Russia, the gulf monarchies. Israel starts to get worried about Hezbollah and Iran, so Israel cuts a deal with Russia to keep Iran out of southern Syria.

If it doesn't get any worse than that, now all of a sudden, you have got the Kurds who declare war on Syria, and it makes it a little messy that the Kurds are also in conflict with Türkiye, which is a NATO ally.

Then somehow the United States in 2015, says, you know what? We need to get involved in this mess in Syria.

Since we have been there, we have seen Americans die. We have seen tens of billions of dollars wasted.

What is hilarious about the 2001 AUMF—that the neo-conservatives wave around like some permission slip for every neo-conservative fantasy of turning an Arabian desert into a Jeffersonian democracy—is that that very 2001 AUMF would justify attacking the people that we are fighting against and the people we are funding because both have ties to al-Qaida and, of course, the 2001 AUMF dealt with al-Qaida.

All this talk about a reemergence of ISIS; I would encourage my colleagues

to go read the inspector general's report of the last quarter that indicates that ISIS is not a threat to the homeland. And with the Turks conducting operations in Syria against ISIS, with Assad and Russia having every incentive to create pressure on ISIS, I do not believe that what stands between a caliphate and not a caliphate are the 900 Americans who have been sent to this hellscape with no definition of victory, with no clear objective, and purely existing as a vestige to the regime change failed foreign policies of multiple former Presidents.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE).

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 21 to pull forces out of Syria.

Like many in this distinguished Chamber, I have served in the region. I spent 23 years as a Navy SEAL. I have hunted war criminals. I have dismantled terrorist cells, and I have fought for freedom on foreign shores.

There are several self-evident truths in Syria. First, the U.S. troops are authorized by Congress.

Second, I do believe that we should review those authorizations. They may need to be reviewed. We should have answers on objectives, on failures, on victories, on a plan for ultimate success. I agree.

But there is no doubt that Syria also remains a center for radical Islamic forces and terrorism, like ISIS, like PKK. These are organizations that will never stop, ever. They are committed to destroying this Nation and our allies, and we should be aware of their objectives.

Lastly, the hard truth is this: Either we fight them in Syria or we will fight them here. Either we fight and defeat them in Syria, or we will fight in the streets of our Nation.

To understand the scope of the military presence, we are talking about 900 troops. That is 900 troops that have to have the capability for intelligence collection, self-defense, surveillance, targeting. In case our troops get in trouble, that force must be sufficient to get them out of trouble because every sailor, soldier, airman, and marine, deserves nothing less.

Nine hundred military personnel is an objectively small contingent. When you look at it, that is about the size of a Walmart which employs, on average, 300 people.

So I agree with many of the supporters of the resolution that Congress has the powers, and these powers should be reviewed. We should ask the hard questions: What is the path to victory?

What are the resources that are being spent? Are they being spent in the right spot?

Is there a clear path to victory, and what are the interests of the United States?

But believe me, Mr. Speaker, I understand the burden of war. I have lost a lot of friends. I understand the consequences of war on foreign shores, both to the servicemen and our families, which is why I call on my colleagues today to ask the right questions, but to reject this well-intended, but really, really bad idea.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this resolution, and I want to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman and the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

For all those reasons, we cannot withdraw our 900 troops now because of what was said about ISIS.

But in addition to that, we are defending the Kurds against certain slaughter at the hands of the Peshmerga if we were to withdraw our troops.

□ 1430

The Turks, as we know, are supporting the Peshmerga. In addition to which, if we were to withdraw our troops, that increases the worry that Israel has to have about Iran, and that increases the odds of a conflict between Israel and Iran, which is the last thing the Middle East needs or the world needs.

For all these reasons, I strongly urge this body to reject this resolution. We truly should review all of the AUMFs we have lying around. I didn't know we had one from 1991. This resolution is the wrong vehicle, and it is productive of chaos and probably slaughter. I, therefore, oppose it.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, my patriotic colleague, Mr. ZINKE of Montana, gave up the game when he said ISIS will never be gone. So, presumably, the position of those holding that viewpoint is that we have to stay in Syria forever, maybe make it the 51st State.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE), a member of the Homeland Security Committee and the House Oversight Committee.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have the great privilege of serving with many veterans here in Congress, and to them, I am so grateful for their service. This is also why I rise in support for this resolution, to pull our great military from Syria.

I would point out, on the official website for the U.S. Department of Defense, when it tells who the Department of Defense is on the "about" page, it says: We are your defense. The Department of Defense is America's largest government agency. With our military tracing its roots back to prerevolutionary times, the Department has grown and evolved with our Nation. Our mission is to provide the

military forces needed to deter war and ensure our Nation's security.

That is the job of our Department of Defense, not to wage war in foreign lands and foreign countries at the expense of the American taxpayer. It is to deter war.

It is also the role of the Department of Defense to ensure our Nation's security, but our border is being ignored. Every single day, our border is invaded by thousands, and over 300 Americans die daily from fentanyl brought into our country by Mexican cartels. I would say those are the enemies we need to be focusing on, not in a country called Syria where no one in my district ever demands: "Marjorie, we must go to war in Syria." I never hear that request from anyone who voted for me.

As a matter of fact, the veterans in my district say: We are sick and tired of foreign wars. We are fed up with it, and too many of our American military have died in foreign lands serving their foreign borders and their foreign causes.

I thank my colleague, MATT GAETZ, for introducing this resolution, and I strongly encourage all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 21.

Stopping the resurgence of ISIS now, before more attacks on American families, is critical. My appreciation of military service is as a 31-year Army veteran myself, but I am particularly grateful that I have had four sons: Alan, who served in Iraq; Addison, who served in Iraq; Julian, who served in Egypt; and my youngest son, Hunter, who did a tour in Afghanistan. So I know personally the significance of military service.

I think of the last 20 years that our military, because of 9/11, has stopped attacks in the United States. So this strength must be maintained.

At the height of ISIS' reign of terror, Operation Inherent Resolve was formally launched in October of 2015 to counter the terrorist network's rapid expansion in Iraq and Syria. Upon defeat of the physical caliphate in Baghouz in 2019, the United States conducted a drawdown of forces.

Currently, there are approximately 900 U.S. soldiers in northeast Syria. The remaining troops assist the Syrian Democratic forces in deterrence of continued terrorist threats from Iranian-backed terror organizations and maintenance of facilities containing—amazing; this is incredible; the American people need to know—10,000 hardened ISIS prisoners who are dedicated and trained mass murderers, along with thousands of their radicalized family members.

While the American-led coalition was successful, the threat of ISIS and the

extremism in the region remain. Reporting indicates that ISIS is making significant efforts to reorganize in Syria and Iraq. Iranian-backed terrorists, who back up the murderous regime of Bashar al-Assad, also continue attacks on U.S. forces at Al-Tanf and pose a tremendous destabilizing effect. Upon withdrawal, terrorists would also have unfettered access to the Omar oil field.

A full withdrawal of the efficient forces remaining would completely open the region to the resurgence of ISIS and other terrorist organizations whose mission is the destruction of American families.

Such a threat to American national security would warrant intervention. Uprooting the small contingent of troops who have successfully maintained order to the extent possible would simply ensure that we will be returning to a much larger, more complex problem at a higher cost and threat to Americans worldwide.

The resolution, we know, is well-intended, but deterrence is cheaper and more effective than facilitating a full-scale response after the fact. We don't need to repeat 9/11. Peace is best maintained through strength.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW).

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Con. Res. 21.

Now, I have been one of the most vocal proponents in this Congress on reasserting congressional authority in matters of war and peace, because the Constitution delegates to this body the decision to debate and decide when to send our men and women into harm's way.

Now, Congress after Congress has abdicated that authority to both Republican and Democratic administrations. Yes, it is time to pull it back, and it is time to reassert our authority and to have the debates that have been long overdue for many, many years. I join my bipartisan colleagues in that endeavor, because it is a right, true, and just endeavor, and we owe our constituents nothing less.

There is a good way to do it, and there is a wrong way to do it. I rise in opposition to this concurrent resolution, because it is the wrong way to do it for three reasons.

Many of us have spent the morning in the Foreign Affairs Committee rehashing the disaster of the 20 years in Afghanistan and hearing about the moral stain of our partners and allies that we have left behind in Afghanistan. I am not willing to make that mistake again, of saying that we will leave behind the Kurds and the Syrian Democratic forces and our other partners who have fought side-by-side with us in years past and again today.

Number two, the dangers that ISIS poses to the American people are well documented, and we are not prepared yet to abdicate and turn our back on that threat.

Number three, any military person knows that retrograde operations or withdrawal operations are the riskiest operations that you can conduct. Setting an arbitrary timeline on a retrograde that is not tied to defined benchmarks or operational requirements is the wrong way to do it and puts our men and women at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to my colleague, I would observe that we have done a lot for the Kurds: \$1.5 billion. We can love the Kurds, but it is not a marriage. It is not until death do we part. It seems as though the Kurds have made book with Assad and that that would provide a structure for them to continue to exist.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLS), a patriotic American who served in our military, who served in Iraq and Syria, a member of the House Armed Services Committee and my colleague.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the 2001 and 2002 Authorizations for Use of Military Force licensed the executive branch to conduct broad military operations, and Congress has disregarded its constitutional oversight powers as a result. Repealing these outdated AUMFs restores Congress' constitutional check on executive fiat.

The United States military forces are present in the Middle East pursuant to an Authorization for Use of Military Force that was enacted more than 20 years ago. At that time, Congress did not conceive that these authorizations would sanction an endless military commitment.

The United States is not the world's policeman, and it is incredibly unwise to promote this level of involvement in international disputes. However, Democrat and Republican Presidents alike have abused the powers of war granted under the 2001 and 2002 AUMFs, and Congress must act to reign back the executive branch's war authorities.

Further, continuing to dump trillions of dollars into these endless wars is irresponsible, runs contrary to American economic and security interests, and unnecessarily places American lives in jeopardy.

It is clear that the basis for the AUMFs currently in force have long expired, and Congress must fulfill its constitutional responsibility and ensure we are conducting proper oversight of the executive branch's military operations.

Now, I hear my colleagues on the left talking about leaving the Kurds and withdrawals, but yet, I note these are the exact same individuals that their party argues that it was time to withdraw from Afghanistan and leave our allies and Americans behind, something I know about, since I am the only Member of Congress who actually conducted the first overland rescue of Americans out of Afghanistan after they were left behind.

I also note that these are the same people saying that pulling away is

going to increase ISIS' presence. Is this not the exact same government that said that nation building was a great strategy for Iraq? Is this not the same government who utilized and helped to implement the 2005 Iraq Constitution that implemented Article 76 that sets forth a sectarian democracy giving rise to Iran's political stronghold?

I have spent 7 years of my life in Iraq, almost 3 years in Afghanistan, Kosovo, Pakistan, northern Somalia, been blown up twice in 2006, a Bronze Star recipient, and a proud combat veteran. I can tell you that in the 20-plus years that we served in Iraq and Afghanistan, had it been a counterterrorism operation or counterinsurgency strategy, I could have fully gotten behind that. But we continue to play political football, and that is exactly what the dangers of AUMFs are. They allow people to basically do *carte blanche* with warfare, and that is not the intent.

In fact, I would argue that we have already lost the advantage, and we should be refocusing our efforts on what is happening at our southern border, where just a day ago, we had two Americans who were killed by what I would consider to be a worthy adversary, which is the cartels.

So we sit here today, and I am not going to talk about the arguments of the \$86 billion that we left behind when we talk about the ISIS buildup.

Let's talk about the ISIS buildup. What about ISIS-Khorasan? What about the Haqqani network? What about the Taliban, who has \$86 billion in weapons, armament, defense products, millions of dollars of pallets of cash? They are now the closest to being a true caliph with an actual sovereignty in its borders and a recognized government. That is who we need to be concerned with.

When I went to Afghanistan, I thought it was to help to fight from this becoming a safe haven of terrorism. Instead, we have actually promoted, funded, trained, and actually made it a safe haven of terrorism.

The American people are not about endless wars. The American people are about us being involved in things that we have control over. Unfortunately, due to the political football and the fact that it was the suits, not the boots, making the decisions, we have no clear military objective, and that is why this has continued to be a failure.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my colleague, who serves with me on the Foreign Affairs Committee, we are a lot in agreement. I think the 2001 AUMF is outdated, and it should have been sunsetted. Congress has a constitutional responsibility to address this. Now, as chairman, that is my intention, and I hope to work with the gentleman on this.

But the point is, this is a privileged resolution under the War Powers Act 5(c), section (c), that basically says if

U.S. forces are engaged in hostilities without authorization, such forces shall be removed by the President, if directed by a congressional concurrent resolution.

We have authorization here, and it is the 2001 AUMF. We may not like that. We can debate whether we need to update this thing, and I think we do. The ranking member and I have had these discussions, as well. But that is really the centerpiece of what we are talking about on this privileged resolution.

So when this is all said and done, I hope we can perhaps work on updating this outdated authorized use of military force to what is the modern-day threat.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER).

□ 1445

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I acknowledge and thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, for his service and for his insights, which are invaluable to our committee and the work that we are doing. I thank him.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 21, which would remove the United States Armed Forces from Syria.

While the situation in the Middle East remains complicated and volatile, we must not forget the critical role that the United States plays in furthering peace and combating international terrorism in the region.

As the chairman just pointed out, the use of military force is authorized under the 2001 agreement. We must fulfill our obligations in rooting out al-Qaida and its direct successors in ISIS.

As a resident of New York who was in his fifth day of freshman year of high school on September 11, I will never forget the events of that day, what occurred and the aftermath of it, and our obligation to combat and confront terrorism wherever it rears its head.

ISIS may no longer hold territory, but they are still a threat. They were responsible for 72 terrorist attacks in Iraq and Syria in the last quarter of 2022 alone. Just last month, U.S. Forces killed a senior ISIS leader in Syria.

ISIS once held territory the size of Great Britain, but thanks to our ongoing efforts, it no longer does. A complete withdrawal of U.S. Forces, however, will have the same disastrous consequences as our rapid withdrawal from Afghanistan, a topic on which our committee is holding a hearing today. Without U.S. Forces in Syria, our enemies will return; they will regrow; and they will come after our allies and, potentially, the United States.

While I appreciate and support the desire to prevent any further loss of American life and limb, there is no doubt in my mind that if we let international terrorist groups run rampant in Syria and throughout the Middle East, especially in the wake of a devastating natural disaster that the



country just experienced, we are abdicating our responsibility to keep the American people safe from harm.

Not only that but by maintaining our troop presence in Syria, we can continue to support our allies in the region and work toward a more stable and peaceful Middle East, including supporting and growing the Abraham Accords.

Of course, we must always prioritize the safety and well-being of our military personnel, and any decision to maintain a true presence in Syria must be carefully considered and strategically planned. The Biden administration must be cognizant of this fact and not allow our true presence in Syria to go the way of the disastrous Afghanistan withdrawal.

I agree with my colleagues about the need to reevaluate and look at the AUMFs, reform the process, and move forward, but we need to do so in a deliberative manner. This is not the way to go about it. For those reasons, I cannot in good conscience support this.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this body will reject this resolution and allow our committee to do the work that it needs to do to reform this process.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, the safety and security of the United States over 21 years since 9/11 is no accident. It is due to the sweat, toil, and blood of thousands of young Americans.

Many Americans have enjoyed the fruits of this labor with not contributing anything to the cost. As a veteran of the war on terror myself, I stand here today and, from the bottom of my heart, genuinely wish I could tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I could tell my colleagues: "Mission accomplished. We can go home." I truly wish I could say that, but the mission is not accomplished yet. It is not finished. There is still work to do, which our troops in Syria carry on today.

ISIS remains the deadliest terrorist threat in the world. The work that these troops do day in and day out is a relatively small investment in our security and the security of our allies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I share the general consensus that we should re-debate the AUMF. That is Congress' job. I have voted for measures similar to this in the past that will force that debate. We should force Congress to debate the AUMF, but we should not force our troops to withdraw.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, Republicans and Democrats alike have been citing the 2001 AUMF. It is important to note that there are Americans fighting in Syria today who were not born when the 2001 AUMF was approved.

About 9 out of every 10 of us in the House of Representatives weren't here to vote on it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ) for sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no legal authority for the U.S. to be involved in the Syrian civil war. There is no authority.

Section 5(c) of the War Powers Act does not say, and I am quoting the chairman now, it does not say, "without authorization." That is not the language. The language says, "specific statutory authorization." You either declare war or you have specific statutory authority.

Do you know what that 2001 AUMF says? It says those who "aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001." It doesn't say "ISIS." It doesn't say "Syria." It is talking about the events of 2001, as the gentleman from Florida just referenced.

It is a quaint idea to say we are going to rely on that 2001 AUMF. I thought they were going to say they were relying on the 2002 AUMF. Either way, neither one works. You don't have authority, and you are going to be there and put U.S. soldiers in harm's way. This is a civil war.

One Syrian analyst said this recently: "Until we see the externals confront each other directly rather than on the Syrian ground, I don't see an actual end to the Syrian conflict."

Do you know who the externals are? The U.S., the Russians, and Iran. That is the externals, and we have no authority to be one of those externals. The analyst went on to say this is a proxy war. That is what is happening. It is another U.S.-Russia proxy war.

When the Syrian civil war began with protests during the Arab Spring of 2011, U.S. President Obama went to the regime in Syria and said: "The future of Syria must be determined by its people, but President Bashar al-Assad is standing in the way. For the sake of the Syrian people, the time has come for President Assad to step aside."

Is that our objective—regime change? Is that what it is? No. We don't know what the objective is. You can't even define what the exit ramp is.

Assad responded that time by fueling the civil war, the exacerbation of that problem, and it has just grown. Now, you have us with our allies the Turks and our allies the Kurds. They are fighting against each other. They don't want each other.

ISIS, in 2019, was declared to be defeated. Even the inspector general recently said they don't have an ability to cause damage and fear and harm in the homeland.

The result is, in the last 13 years, the U.S. has spent more than \$15 billion on humanitarian aid, and we don't even know what we have spent in Department of Defense costs. Do you know why? Because they are grouping it with what is going on in Iraq. We tried to

obtain information. How much have we spent? Nobody will tell us.

When General Milley says—by the way, he was the architect of that disastrous Afghanistan retreat, and he is a believer in a "however long, no matter the cost" approach in Ukraine. He insists we prolong our involvement in the civil war in Syria in order to help our allies.

General Milley, who are our allies? Is it the Kurds? Is it the Turks? Who is it? Is it the Assad regime?

He can't tell you. No one can tell you.

All of this is being done, though, without legal authority. It is time for us to stop fighting proxy wars. It is time for us not to say next time we will take care of these AUMFs. We have had time. This is the time to get rid of them. I urge us to vote for this.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today as a Member of Congress who has proudly worked to fight and defeat terrorism as a CIA officer. I worked with my colleagues to protect the lives of the American people, our servicemembers, and our interests around the world.

I fully agree that we need to revisit our Authorizations for Use of Military Force. I have worked with Members of Congress, including the esteemed gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), to raise this issue. I am proud to see that we are actually seeing progress toward the repeal of the 1991 and 2002 AUMFs. That is encouraging.

However, that does not mean that we should abandon ongoing operations that keep the United States safe that are authorized under the 2001 AUMF. Should we discuss it? Should we debate it? Should we look toward reforming it? Perhaps. Should we order the men and women in uniform to come home over the next few months? Absolutely not.

We should not encourage a resurgence of ISIS. We should not abandon our work with the Kurdish fighters on the front lines. We should understand the implications for the long-term stability of the Middle East and the actions we take here today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Virginia.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I oppose the resolution to withdraw quickly from Syria, and I look forward to earnest, bipartisan, forward-looking conversations about how we can reassert our constitutional role and protect our ongoing work to defeat terrorism and keep the homeland safe.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, Syria is such a mess. We are sometimes funding both sides in the same battle.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an L.A. Times piece titled: "In Syria, militias armed by the Pentagon fight those armed by the CIA."

[From the L.A. Times, Mar. 27, 2016]

IN SYRIA, MILITIAS ARMED BY THE PENTAGON  
FIGHT THOSE ARMED BY THE CIA

(By Nabih Bulos, W.J. Hennigan, Brian Bennett)

Syrian militias armed by different parts of the U.S. war machine have begun to fight each other on the plains between the besieged city of Aleppo and the Turkish border, highlighting how little control U.S. intelligence officers and military planners have over the groups they have financed and trained in the bitter five-year-old civil war.

The fighting has intensified over the last two months, as CIA-armed units and Pentagon-armed ones have repeatedly shot at each other while maneuvering through contested territory on the northern outskirts of Aleppo, U.S. officials and rebel leaders have confirmed.

In mid-February, a CIA-armed militia called Fursan al Haq, or Knights of Righteousness, was run out of the town of Marea, about 20 miles north of Aleppo, by Pentagon-backed Syrian Democratic Forces moving in from Kurdish-controlled areas to the east.

"Any faction that attacks us, regardless from where it gets its support, we will fight it," Maj. Fares Bayoush, a leader of Fursan al Haq, said in an interview.

Rebel fighters described similar clashes in the town of Azaz, a key transit point for fighters and supplies between Aleppo and the Turkish border, and on March 3 in the Aleppo neighborhood of Sheikh Maqoud.

The attacks by one U.S.-backed group against another come amid continued heavy fighting in Syria and illustrate the difficulty facing U.S. efforts to coordinate among dozens of armed groups that are trying to overthrow the government of President Bashar Assad, fight the Islamic State militant group and battle one another all at the same time.

"It is an enormous challenge," said Rep. Adam Schiff (D-Burbank), the top Democrat on the House Intelligence Committee, who described the clashes between U.S.-supported groups as "a fairly new phenomenon."

"It is part of the three-dimensional chess that is the Syrian battlefield," he said.

The area in northern Syria around Aleppo, the country's second-largest city, features not only a war between the Assad government and its opponents, but also periodic battles against Islamic State militants, who control much of eastern Syria and also some territory to the northwest of the city, and long-standing tensions among the ethnic groups that inhabit the area, Arabs, Kurds and Turkmen.

"This is a complicated, multi-sided war where our options are severely limited," said a U.S. official, who wasn't authorized to speak publicly on the matter. "We know we need a partner on the ground. We can't defeat ISIL without that part of the equation, so we keep trying to forge those relationships." ISIL is an acronym for Islamic State.

President Obama this month authorized a new Pentagon plan to train and arm Syrian rebel fighters, relaunching a program that was suspended in the fall after a string of embarrassing setbacks which included recruits being ambushed and handing over much of their U.S.-issued ammunition and trucks to an Al Qaeda affiliate.

Amid the setbacks, the Pentagon late last year deployed about 50 special operations forces to Kurdish-held areas in northeastern Syria to better coordinate with local militias and help ensure U.S.-backed rebel groups aren't fighting one another. But such skirmishes have become routine.

Last year, the Pentagon helped create a new military coalition, the Syrian Democratic Forces. The goal was to arm the group and prepare it to take territory away from the Islamic State in eastern Syria and to provide information for U.S. airstrikes.

The group is dominated by Kurdish outfits known as People's Protection Units or YPG. A few Arab units have joined the force in order to prevent it from looking like an invading Kurdish army, and it has received airstrikes of weapons and supplies and assistance from U.S. Special Forces.

Gen. Joseph Votel, now commander of U.S. Special Operations Command and the incoming head of Central Command, said this month that about 80 percent of the fighters in the Syrian Democratic Forces were Kurdish. The U.S. backing for a heavily Kurdish armed force has been a point of tension with the Turkish government, which has a long history of crushing Kurdish rebellions and doesn't want to see Kurdish units control more of its southern border.

The CIA, meanwhile, has its own operations center inside Turkey from which it has been directing aid to rebel groups in Syria, providing them with TOW antitank missiles from Saudi Arabian weapons stockpiles.

While the Pentagon's actions are part of an overt effort by the U.S. and its allies against Islamic State, the CIA's backing of militias is part of a separate covert U.S. effort aimed at keeping pressure on the Assad government in hopes of prodding the Syrian leader to the negotiating table.

At first, the two different sets of fighters were primarily operating in widely separated areas of Syria—the Pentagon-backed Syrian Democratic Forces in the northeastern part of the country and the CIA-backed groups farther west. But over the last several months, Russian airstrikes against anti-Assad fighters in northwestern Syria have weakened them. That created an opening which allowed the Kurdish-led groups to expand their zone of control to the outskirts of Aleppo, bringing them into more frequent conflict with the CIA-backed outfits.

"Fighting over territory in Aleppo demonstrates how difficult it is for the U.S. to manage these really localized and in some cases entrenched conflicts," said Nicholas A. Heras, an expert on the Syrian civil war at the Center for a New American Security, a think tank in Washington. "Preventing clashes is one of the constant topics in the joint operations room with Turkey."

Over the course of the Syrian civil war, the town of Marea has been on the front line of Islamic State's attempts to advance across Aleppo province toward the rest of northern Syria.

On Feb. 18, the Syrian Democratic Forces attacked the town. A fighter with the Suqour Al-Jabal brigade, a group with links to the CIA, said intelligence officers of the U.S.-led coalition fighting Islamic State know their group has clashed with the Pentagon-trained militias.

"The MOM knows we fight them," he said, referring to the joint operations center in southern Turkey, using an abbreviation for its name in Turkish, Musterek Operasyon Merkezi. "We'll fight all who aim to divide Syria or harm its people." The fighter spoke on condition of anonymity.

Marea is home to many of the original Islamist fighters who took up arms against Assad during the Arab Spring in 2011. It has long been a crucial way station for supplies and fighters coming from Turkey into Aleppo.

"Attempts by Syrian Democratic Forces to take Marea was a great betrayal and was viewed as a further example of a Kurdish conspiracy to force them from Arab and Turkmen lands," Heras said.

The clashes brought the U.S. and Turkish officials to "loggerheads," he added. After diplomatic pressure from the U.S., the militia withdrew to the outskirts of the town as a sign of good faith, he said.

But continued fighting among different U.S.-backed groups may be inevitable, experts on the region said.

"Once they cross the border into Syria, you lose a substantial amount of control or ability to control their actions," Jeffrey White, a former Defense Intelligence Agency official, said in a telephone interview. "You certainly have the potential for it becoming a larger problem as people fight for territory and control of the northern border area in Aleppo."

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA), a veteran and also a military spouse of one of our brave patriots who fought in Syria.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I will start out by saying ISIS has been destroyed. A few hundred troops will not stop the next terrorist dot-com, and that is never going to end. I am, frankly, tired of hearing the sentiment on both sides that if we do not fight them there, they will come here. There are way too many countries to apply that logic.

If we are so concerned, then why is the majority of the U.S. Government stagnant on the southern border where it matters. Terrorists are literally walking in.

Better yet, if that is a true concern, then why did we leave billions of dollars in equipment during a botched withdrawal in Afghanistan? Do you really think terrorist dot-coms aren't going to use that equipment like ISIS did?

Peace is accomplished through superior firepower, strong leadership, and a plan, not blunders of failed foreign policy literally repeating itself.

We have zero strategic advantage and zero reason to be in Syria. In fact, they don't even want us there.

Al-Assad and Putin are tight. If you check out some of Russia's naval warships, they are actually hanging out in the western port of Syria. What we need to be focusing on is a bigger issue like China.

Syria is a very dangerous place for us to be leaving a few hundred Americans. We are better off sending those troops to places like South America, where we can build stronger and useful allies who will actually work with us.

Make no mistake, if we take China at their word, a near-peer fight is coming. It will require 100 percent of our military and more than the American people are going to pay for it. That is why I support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, if I can also add, to those of my colleagues that had mentioned the Kurds, our NATO ally Türkiye, who is not the best NATO ally, might I add, has deemed them a terrorist organization. After the take-back of Mosul, we actually turned our back on them after promising to recognize them as a nation at the United Nations.

□ 1500

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank the ranking member of the committee and the chairman of the committee, and my colleague from the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Florida, because this is a thoughtful initiative dealing with a question that Congress must confront, and that is the AUMF in its totality. We have had it since 2001, and I believe that is an important discussion.

I would like to distinguish, however, what I think is an area that does not warrant the removal of 900 of our troops. It is a tough area. It is an area in Syria where if you talk to Syrian Americans, Mr. Speaker, they want the people of Syria to be protected.

In my meetings with the President of Syria so many years ago, I had hoped for a new vision with Syria. I had hoped for an ally with Syrians.

Syrian Americans want democracy. In this instance, we are on the border in a very tough location, and I have to look at the humanitarian question. I have to look at the issue of the protection of women and children as well as the Kurds. The Kurds have no one but us, and the opposition has a strong ally as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I recognize the fact that we all want peace, but in this instance—also in the midst of the crisis of the earthquake—we knew the stories and heard the stories that the Syrians in that area were not getting help because of the conflict and fighting. That is tragic that we allow people to be desperate and need humanitarian aid because they cannot get the protection they need.

It is important for the stability of that area, for the protection of women and children, and to save lives that at this time we do not withdraw our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose the underlying legislation and to respect the gentleman for the discussion that I think we should have.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to my remaining time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues how many more remaining speakers they have and are they prepared to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from New York has 7½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Florida has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, much of the discussion today has revolved around whether or not withdrawing from Syria will ignite some new ISIS caliphate. We have pointed out time and again to inspector general reports saying that is unlikely.

I am not entirely sure that our having troops in Syria deters ISIS more than it is a recruiting tool for ISIS.

Moreover, President Trump said that if Russia wanted to kill ISIS, then we should let them. I think there is wisdom in that.

Both Assad and Turkiye are in stronger positions today to put downward pressure on ISIS. Maybe if we weren't giving weapons to people shooting at Assad, then Assad would have every incentive to be able to engage ISIS in a way to ensure that it doesn't come back.

We have to also acknowledge Syria and Iraq are the two countries on the planet Earth where we have done the most to fund ISIS. We give weapons to these so-called moderate rebels—which I actually thought was an oxymoron—and it turns out that they are not so moderate. Sometimes the rebels we fund to go fight Assad turn around and raise the ISIS flag.

So it is quite silly to be saying we have to withdraw to stop ISIS when it is our very presence in Syria in some cases that has been the best gift to ISIS.

There are groups like al-Nusra and associated entities that are like our frenemies when they are in Syria, and then they cross over the border into Iraq and they become full-fledged jihadists posing a so-called threat to the homeland. There are 1,500 different groups in Syria, so today's friend is tomorrow's ISIS.

There is no real clear delineation as to what the enduring defeat of ISIS means.

Do we have to keep 900 Americans in Syria until the last heartbeat stops of the last person who holds some sympathy for ISIS?

I would certainly hope not. It would mean we would have to be there forever.

Israel has made their deal with Russia to be protected, the Kurds have made their peace with Assad to be protected, and what we see among this quagmire is that there is really not a role for the United States of America in Syria.

We are not a Middle Eastern power. We have tried this time and again to build a democracy out of sand, blood, and Arab militias, and time and again the work we do does not reduce chaos. Oftentimes it causes chaos, the very chaos that then subsequently leads to terrorism.

My colleagues and my staff who have served in Syria and my constituents tell me that often these anti-ISIS raids are just raids of local thugs and drug dealers who have some cousin that is in ISIS, and it is not appropriate to put Americans at risk.

Often our Americans are guarding these oil fields where the Iranians are sending Kamikaze drones, and I am shocked that we have not had escalatory accidents or even more casualties for our U.S. servicemembers.

So if this is all one big Georgetown School of Foreign Service essay exam about great power competition in Syria, then you go tell that to the parents of the Americans who have to sleep tonight in Syria, and who have to guard oil fields with Iranian drones coming at them, that they are necessary to preserve the balance of power. That is not true.

The Kurds have an opportunity to pave their path. Let's pave ours. And if we are so worried about threats to the homeland, how about we actually focus on our true point of vulnerability, which is not the emergence of some caliphate, it is the fact that terrorists are crossing our southern border on a daily, weekly, and monthly basis. We seem far less concerned about that than we undeniably should be.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this resolution to reassert Congress' power to speak on these matters of war and peace. So often we come to the floor and we debate frivolities. This is one of the most important things we can be talking about: how we use the credibility of our fellow Americans, how we spend America's treasure, and how we spill the blood of our bravest patriots.

We have stained the deserts in the Middle East with enough American blood. It is time to bring our servicemembers home.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that is clear from this debate that I think we all can agree upon: We need to debate and look at AUMFs and that Congress must assert its authority that the Constitution has given us. I think that that is something that we can all agree and work together on.

Chairman MCCAUL and I had these conversations last year in the last Congress, and we will continue to have them on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I am sure, because it is important.

For me, the toughest votes that I have had as a Member of Congress is to determine whether or not we should send our women and men into combat. So I should not now, because it is a tough vote, yield that to anyone because it is my responsibility and our responsibility as Members of Congress to make that decision.

I, again, call on Members to oppose this measure as such a forced premature end to our presence and joint

efforts in northeast Syria because this not only threatens to give ISIS an opportunity to resurge and again use Syria as a launchpad for attacks throughout the region and beyond, but it also leaves our Syrian partners out to dry.

Any withdrawal of U.S. forces must be done in close coordination with our coalition allies and partners because our courageous Syrian opposition friends need to be a part of this, and we need to talk to them in a manner that ensures our national security.

I hope my colleagues will join me as I oppose this resolution and look forward to a future debate on AUMF issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, it has been a good debate. There is nothing more important in this body than issues of war and peace and what we have been talking about today.

I was a counterterrorism Federal prosecutor after 9/11 and the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee when ISIS and the caliphate were at their strength with external operations and, yes, the southern border and the threat that that poses. We can talk about the merits some more, and I appreciate this discussion.

But at the heart of this under the War Powers Resolution privilege is, and I am quoting directly: “. . . that United States Armed Forces are engaged in hostilities . . . without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization, such forces shall be removed by the President if the Congress so directs. . . .”

The authority is there, and if you look under the AUMF of 2001 “. . . to prevent any future acts of international terrorism. . . .”

I want to close with what President Trump said. I was a part of this decision with him on June 9, 2020. He said:

Since October 7, 2001, United States Armed Forces have conducted counterterrorism operations against al-Qaida. Since August of 2014, they have targeted the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, otherwise known as ISIS, formerly known as al-Qaida in Iraq.

These ongoing operations have been successful in seriously degrading ISIS capabilities in Syria and Iraq.

If we want to start having a debate without repealing and replacing the 2001 AUMF, then I would just argue to my colleagues that that would be the productive route to fix this issue of whether the United States should be present in the Middle East at all.

And to close, our Afghanistan hearing, what a mess we have left behind and what a threat that has become, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution.

The question is on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1515

#### PROTECTING SPEECH FROM GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE ACT

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 140.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GROTHMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 199 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H.R. 140.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1515

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 140) to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit Federal employees from advocating for censorship of viewpoints in their official capacity, and for other purposes, with Mr. FLOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 140, the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act. This legislation is clearly needed.

During the Oversight and Accountability Committee's February 8 hearing on protecting speech from government interference and social media bias, the Oversight and Accountability Committee learned just how easy it

was for the Federal Government to influence a private company to accomplish what it constitutionally cannot, and that is limit the free exercise of speech.

At the hearing, we heard hours of witness testimony that revealed the extent to which Federal employees have repeatedly and consistently communicated with social media platforms to censor and suppress the lawful speech of Americans.

The hearing exposed just how much the Biden administration attempted to normalize a policy of Federal censorship. Biden administration officials have publicly called upon and privately coordinated with private-sector social media companies to ban specific accounts viewed as politically inconvenient.

During our February 8 hearing, one of our witnesses, a former FBI official and former Twitter employee, called for Federal legislation that would reasonably and effectively limit government interactions with private-sector platforms.

I agree with him. It is inappropriate and dangerous for the Federal Government to decide what lawful speech is allowed on a private-sector platform.

My bill, the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act, makes this type of behavior an unlawful activity for Federal officials to engage in, subjecting those who attempt to censor the lawful speech of Americans to disciplinary actions and monetary penalties.

The Federal Government should not be able to decide what lawful speech is allowed. We have the First Amendment for a very good reason. Federal officials, no matter their rank or resources, must be prohibited from coercing the private sector to suppress certain information or limit the ability of citizens to freely express their own views on a private-sector internet platform.

Former White House Press Secretary Jen Psaki, for example, should not have been free to use her official authority to openly call for Facebook or any other social media company to ban specific accounts or types of speech from its platform. That was not an appropriate use of the authorities or resources of a senior executive branch official.

Further, Federal employees should not feel empowered to infringe on the independence of private entities by pressuring them to complicate or change their community guidelines and content modernization policies.

If the Biden administration needs to express its policy positions or political preferences, it has immense communication resources of its own through which to engage in the public square and offer its information and arguments.

If the administration feels it is losing the policy argument and the public's

confidence to stronger voices, the answer should never be to deploy the resources and power of the Federal Government to limit the speech of others.

The legislation before us today expands the current Federal employee political activity limitations of the Hatch Act to include a prohibition on Federal employees using their official authority to influence or coerce a private-sector internet platform to censor lawful speech.

This includes a prohibition on actions that would result in a private-sector platform suppressing, restricting, or adding disclaimers or alerts to any lawful speech posted on its platform by a person or entity.

Whether an ordinary citizen or an established media organization, all Americans have a right to utilize these new and powerful communication technology resources to share their views and opinions without Uncle Sam putting his thumb on the scale to tilt the debate in one direction.

Americans know that the First Amendment protects them from this kind of government censorship, protects them from Federal officials who seek to use their positions, their influence, and their resources to censor lawful speech.

The only thing that has changed is that the public square has moved online, with powerful new communication tools.

We are discussing this legislation today because Americans know that something is wrong, and they have asked Congress to fix it.

This bill is a targeted first step to address one clear part of the problem—the troubling development that Federal officials in the U.S. Government view it as their role to censor the speech of Americans.

I urge all my colleagues to support this very necessary legislation.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill purports to protect free speech from government censorship. I agree, it is a great idea. It is such a good idea, in fact, that the Founding Fathers put it in the Constitution. It is called the First Amendment. We don't need a new bill to protect free speech because that is currently the law of the land, so we must ask ourselves: What is the point of this bill?

As our esteemed ranking member observed last night, Vladimir Putin and Xi Jinping probably don't make a habit of watching congressional proceedings, but we are willing to bet that this floor debate is of keen interest to Russian and Chinese agents bent on destabilizing our democracy and influencing our elections to serve their interests.

H.R. 140 would effectively allow these and other foreign malign actors—who have poured hundreds of millions of dollars into online propaganda to create chaos, mistrust, hate, and confu-

sion for Americans—to continue using social media platforms unfettered to wreak havoc on our democratic institutions, including the integrity of our elections.

It would do so by undermining the only defense that we have against these operations, which is the ability of our national security, intelligence, and law enforcement agencies to warn social media platforms and the public about the deployment of counterfeit accounts, disinformation, and cyber surveillance by malign actors.

Now, I have no doubt that my Republican colleagues will claim that, of course, all of our national security apparatus is able to warn social media companies of foreign interference. But the way that this bill is written—even if that is the case, which it is not—they would have to wait 72 hours in order to do that. Seventy-two hours on the internet is a lifetime. Everything that they would want to accomplish would be accomplished within 72 hours.

Now, there are exceptions to that. So, clearly, my Republican colleagues recognize that there need to be exceptions, but those exceptions cover a very, very narrow window, a narrow scope of child pornography, human or drug trafficking, or the dissemination of classified information. Anything else that might not be lawful speech still has to wait 72 hours, far too long.

Now, Democrats acted in good faith to identify and correct these dangerous loopholes in our committee, but all of our amendments were voted down. Our Democratic and Republican colleagues attempted again to address the most dangerous flaws of this bill by submitting 64 amendments for floor consideration, but Republicans only allowed 10 to be considered here today. Of those, only one—one—was offered by a Democrat. So much for all the open floor rules that our Republicans have talked about.

Now, in fairness, Republicans accepted multiple minor amendments that were submitted late, and yet still rejected many of the timely amendments. Some of those Democratic amendments would have cured the obvious weaknesses and loopholes of this unnecessary bill.

There was one amendment that would allow our intelligence community, national security apparatus, and law enforcement to inform social media companies of national security threats.

Another amendment would allow them to inform the social media companies in order to combat domestic and international terrorism.

Another amendment would have addressed fraud targeting seniors.

Another amendment would have ensured the safety of children online. Another amendment prevented attacks on the U.S. Capitol.

One amendment even would have prevented the incitement of violence by Neo-Nazis and other hate groups.

They were all voted down. They even blocked a bipartisan amendment of-

fered by Congresswoman HOULAHAN and Congresswoman MACE to ensure that law enforcement can still act immediately to prevent sexual assault.

By rejecting these commonsense amendments, Republicans have made it clear that this bill is not about protecting the rights and safety of all Americans. In fact, even though there is no evidence—and I will get to that in a minute—that warrants this bill, there is plenty of evidence that Russia interfered in our elections in 2016.

Now, what this bill does is it welcomes the same kind of election interference that we know Russia did in 2016 and that they continue to do today. Just like Donald Trump sided with Vladimir Putin over our intelligence communities in Helsinki in 2018, this bill and the Republicans who are sponsoring this bill are siding with Russia and Vladimir Putin over our national security apparatus and our law enforcement.

My Republican colleagues claim that they have put this bill forward because the FBI somehow colluded with Twitter to suppress the New York Post article on the Hunter Biden laptop story for all of 24 hours 3 weeks before the Presidential election, a private business decision based on the best information available at the time, and which had absolutely no discernible impact on the availability of the article nor the outcome of the election.

The chairman of this committee just referenced a hearing that we had where there were hours of testimony about censorship. Well, the only testimony I witnessed about censorship was former President Trump trying to take down tweets that he did not like on Twitter. There was no evidence—none at all—that the FBI or any other law enforcement agencies directed Twitter to take down any unlawful speech, and that includes the Hunter Biden laptop story.

Now, we can spend some time, although we don't need to, on why that story was both highly suspicious and also glaringly false, but the broader point is that this is a bill that seeks a solution where there is no problem. There is no protected speech that has been prohibited by the Federal Government, and there is no actual evidence of any censorship under the First Amendment.

We are basically trying to change the law to redefine censorship, and in doing so we would be opening up the floodgates to allow for all sorts of unprotected speech to be distributed throughout our social media world online because the government officials who are charged with making sure that our laws are not violated, that crimes are not committed will be handcuffed and unable to do their jobs for fear that they will be fined thousands of dollars if they are wrong.

I urge all my colleagues to stand with free speech and American democracy and oppose this dangerous bill.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman, free speech is under attack here in America, the free United States of America. Putin is a thug, yes. China is a threat. But nothing—and I mean nothing—will bring America to its knees like the removal of our free speech, the cornerstone for our constitutional Republic.

America without free speech is like a phone without a charger. It is only a matter of time before it dies.

□ 1530

Attacks on free speech should not be seen with a partisan lens. Any attack on free speech is an attack on every American who gave their life so that you and I could live freely, so that you and I could express our thoughts, beliefs, and opinions without fear of retribution or persecution.

Mr. Chair, the sad reality is the Biden administration has decided to collude with Big Tech to silence the voice of the American people under the guise of misinformation.

We saw in our committee hearings it was demonstrated that the FBI colluded with Big Tech to silence Americans' free speech. The gentleman from New York says, well, it is Russia and China who are going to interfere with our elections. No, no, Democrats are doing just fine with that on their own. When they have the Federal Government working for them and their agenda to push that forward and silence Americans' free speech, they are doing just fine with election interference.

We have seen the polls that said if Americans knew about the Hunter Biden laptop from hell, the election outcome would have been different, and you all wanted that silenced so greatly.

Now let me ask you—we certainly have the Constitution; I would love to get my colleagues on the other side of the aisle a copy—who decides what is true or false? I certainly don't trust the Federal Government to make that distinction.

They were wrong about the Hunter Biden laptop. They were wrong about the vaccine mandates, about masks, about the Wuhan lab leak, wrong about shutting down churches and schools and businesses, and they are dead wrong to use their positions to attack Americans' free speech.

For the current resident of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, the only thing harder than climbing a flight of stairs, riding a bicycle, or reading a teleprompter seems to be telling the truth.

Free speech isn't just for kind speech or true speech or widely accepted speech, it is for all speech, and it is worth fighting for. I thank my friend, colleague, and chairman of the Oversight and Accountability Committee, Mr. COMER, for his work to preserve free speech in America.

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, I would like to respond briefly because there is all this talk about collusion between the Biden administration and the FBI and Twitter, and you can say it as many times as you want to say it, and it still doesn't make it so because there is no evidence of that.

In this country we rely on facts and evidence. We don't just rely on conclusory allegations including fake polls that don't support what you're trying to say.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LANDSMAN).

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to ensure that this debate is placed in an honest and important historical context.

In the 1930s and early 1940s, Hitler needed America out of his war. He used propaganda in this country to divide us and to keep us out of his war in Europe.

Pro-Hitler propaganda was all over the country, and it reached this body. We know this now. Members of Congress were in on it.

As a Jew, this is frighteningly similar to what is happening today.

One year ago, a new foreign adversary invaded Eastern Europe. Putin, like Hitler, wants us divided and isolated from his war. We must be clear-eyed about pro-Putin propaganda and who and why some intentionally, and others unintentionally, are promoting his will.

Why are we being asked to ban American officials from trying to stop propaganda from foreign adversaries like Putin?

Why are some proposing we leave Syria, which Putin wants?

Why is the call to abandon Ukraine continuing to emerge from some Members?

Remember, Hitler did this. He used Americans to spread his propaganda, and it cost millions their lives. Putin is doing the same thing.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 140 and to call out any and all attempts to promote Putin's propaganda and will.

At the appropriate time I will offer a motion to recommit this bill to committee.

If the House Rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to the bill. The amendment would have delayed implementation of the bill until Federal agencies reported to Congress that this bill would have no negative impact on lawful activities to combat speech that incites violence, discriminatory speech, or domestic terrorism.

The bill as drafted is very unclear on those points. As I and my colleagues have pointed out, if passed, H.R. 140 will encourage the spread of foreign propaganda. It will also promote hateful, harmful, and violent content online, undermine democracy, and make us less safe.

We clearly need more information about the effects this bill would have

on speech that incites violence, discrimination, domestic terrorism, and Federal agencies, including the Department of Justice and the intelligence community, are best positioned to provide that information. These critical issues must be addressed before this bill is implemented.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD the text of my amendment.

Add at the end the following:

**SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE; REPORT ON NEGATIVE EFFECTS.**

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not take effect until the date that the head of each employing agency has submitted a report to Congress confirming that this Act and the amendments made by this Act will have no negative effect on lawful activities to combat—

- (1) speech that incites violence;
- (2) discriminatory speech; or
- (3) domestic terrorism.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, free speech is the cornerstone of a free and thriving society.

Unfortunately, recent revelations made in the Twitter files show that free speech under the First Amendment is under attack—even by those within our own Federal Government.

Our Founding Fathers fought hard to enshrine the right to free speech in our Constitution. As social media companies and Big Tech corporations collude with rogue Federal officials to censor and deplatform members of our free society—including Members of Congress and other conservative voices—we must continue to do everything we can to fight to protect the First Amendment for everyone.

The Protecting Speech for Government Interference Act does exactly that. It is a victory against the modern-day attacks on our freedom, and it is a victory for all freedom-loving citizens of the United States who embrace and accept the right to free speech.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the bill.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I will point out one additional factor here that I think is very important for everyone to consider. When asked what evidence there is that the FBI colluded or directed Twitter to take down any speech, the chairman offered two emails from one specific FBI agent, which suggested that a couple of Twitter handles or tweets had given misleading information very specifically about the time, place, or manner of voting in the upcoming elections.

If my Republican colleagues believe that people should be able to lie on Twitter and provide disinformation about when, where, and how to vote, then they should absolutely support this bill. If that is all that you have, and that is all that you have cited, this bill is a complete waste of time and is totally unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL).



Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my, my, my. If you want to talk about protecting speech from government interference, let's talk about my home State of Florida because nowhere in this country is free speech more endangered than in the Sunshine State.

Florida: Where Republicans are erasing Black history and gender studies from our schools; where Republicans are threatening teachers and librarians with jail time—jail time—if they put books on their shelves that celebrate the likes of Rosa Parks or Roberto Clemente; Florida, where Republicans have made it illegal—illegal—for businesses to promote a culture of diversity, inclusion or respect; Florida, where progressive thinkers are being fired from colleges, and rightwing donors are being appointed to their boards.

It is Florida where Republicans actually punished Disney World because Disney World opposed the State's homophobic legislation. It is the great State of Florida where free speech is only free if you agree with our governor.

If you want to talk about protecting free speech from government interference, let's talk about Florida.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 140, Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act, and I applaud and appreciate Chairman COMER bringing this bill forward.

In a recent hearing held by the Oversight and Accountability Committee with former executives from Twitter, a clear and very disturbing pattern emerged: A coordinated effort between a privately owned social media giant and the Federal Government to suppress critical reporting ahead of the 2020 Presidential election.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government and its legions of unelected bureaucrats must not be the final decisionmaker of what information Americans can and cannot read.

The onus is on Congress to provide a way to effectively prevent Federal bureaucrats from suppressing lawful speech. This bill, H.R. 140, would do just that.

For almost 100 years, the Hatch Act has served as an important barrier against taxpayer-funded employees participating in political activities while on official time, and added suppression of free speech to its list of prohibited activities.

I urge strong support for this legislation, and I am encouraged by Chairman COMER's commitment to thoroughly investigate the ever-increasing encroachment by Big Tech companies into the privacy and First Amendment rights of millions of Americans.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no idea what hearing the gentleman from North Carolina is

referring to, because at the hearing with Twitter executives that I attended where the head of trust and safety was specifically asked if the FBI had given any information, instructions, or directions about the Hunter Biden New York Post story, he specifically said no, they did not receive any information.

If that is what you all think that you are basing this bill on, the actual facts in evidence are precisely the opposite of that.

It is preposterous that you continue to say that over and over and over as if it is true when the evidence is directly contradictory to that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1545

Ms. JACKSON LEE. How grateful I am to be on the floor with the distinguished gentleman from New York and, of course, our distinguished ranking member, who has really laid out the parameters of this legislation. I certainly acknowledge the manager of this underlying legislation and offer my thoughts, with a little bit of consternation.

I cherish the Constitution and cherish the First Amendment. It is first for a reason: The Founding Fathers were wise enough, even with some of the failings of the Constitution, including the existence of slavery—but they were wise enough to understand that the core of democracy is, in fact, the freedom to express, the freedom to associate, the freedom to access, the freedom of religion. The First Amendment captures all of those elements.

I am somewhat lost to connect this legislation to the protection of free speech. I do know that this is part of the unending obsession that my friends on the other side of the aisle have with Mr. Biden, President Biden, and his son.

All investigations that are relevant and that are concerning the American people's integrity or national security are important, but how do you stretch this legislation to suggest that it is a question of free speech in the decisions being made to hold or not hold on purposes that may be business purposes, for all we know, Mr. Chair? It may not be free speech.

I would say that there are many other instances that free speech has been stifled. We cannot discuss the history of African Americans through the misrepresentation of critical race theory.

We are getting orders in our States like Texas to not engage in diversity, equity, and exclusiveness.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. This bill does not deal with free speech. This bill is a

gotcha bill, and I ask my friends if we can, in a coordinated manner, discuss some of the important issues of the day that really need addressing.

I know that we will do the debt ceiling in months to come, but I would argue that we should protect the First Amendment, give everybody a right to freedom of speech and freedom of what they hear.

If they would join me on that, I would welcome their support in what true free speech is. We can hear, and we can speak. That is important.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FRY).

Mr. FRY. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 140, Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act.

I thank Chairman COMER for his leadership and work to bring this issue to the floor, and I appreciate the hard work of the House Oversight Committee.

As promised, House Republicans have already opened the transparency floodgates, shedding light on a slew of this administration's failures and oversteps in their position of power, working against the American people.

Because of this work, the House Oversight Committee has deduced that Federal officials have been using their influence and position of authority to censor Americans on social media platforms.

This is a blatant threat to every single American's First Amendment rights, Mr. Chair. The Federal Government should not be able to nitpick what speech is or isn't allowed in this country or limit citizens from freely voicing their opinions, which includes on social media platforms.

Our government, Mr. Chair, and, indeed, our Constitution were created to protect those freedoms, not suppress them.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill and prohibit Federal employees from using their authority to influence and censor the lawful freedom of speech.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I remind you and everyone that the First Amendment does not protect all speech. It protects lawful speech.

For example, if you make a death threat over the internet, that is not protected speech. That is a Federal crime.

Let's remember, as we take on this absolutist view that all speech is free speech, that there are many restrictions under our laws about what is lawful speech and what is not.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), our constitutional legal scholar and esteemed and distinguished ranking member.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for his excellent leadership on this bill today on the floor.



The distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado posed a question that I have been hearing my Republican colleagues utter over the last several days: Who decides what is true or false? How can we know what is true or false? The gentlewoman confided her fear that the Federal Government would end up defining what is true or false.

Well, my, my, my. That is an absolute assault on the Constitution of the United States because we have an entire Federal judiciary, which is based on people getting up in court and swearing an oath under God or the Constitution to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The whole point of what Federal courts do is to determine what is true and what is false.

Yet, now, we have an entire political party, which is organizing itself around this radical, moral agnosticism, claiming that there is no way we can know the difference between whether an election is on Tuesday or whether an election is on Thursday, as Vladimir Putin wants to tell us through his sinister propaganda put out by the Internet Research Agency.

The whole judicial system is based on the difference between truth and lies.

In fact, the administrative system, do you want to get Social Security? Either you are 65, or you are not. That is a matter of positive fact.

You qualify for Medicare, or you don't. Truth or fact.

Yes, our system operates on the basis of truth or fact. Don't throw up your hands and say: "Oh, well, we can't know what the truth is. We can't know what lies are. We don't want bureaucrats telling us what that is."

That is what democratic government is. That is how we operate, by our commitment to the truth. That is why we all swear an oath here to uphold the Constitution. That is why people go to court and swear an oath to tell the truth.

Now, they take their shocking nihilism about what is true and what is false, and they convert it to this entire Congress. It all starts, of course, with January 6 and, before that, the Presidential election. It all starts with the big lie, Donald Trump's big lie.

They say: "Well, who knows? Maybe he won. Maybe he didn't. You say Joe Biden is President. We say Donald Trump is President." Nonsense.

Mr. Chairman, 60 Federal and State courts rejected every claim of electoral fraud and corruption that they put forward. They don't have a single court that ever ruled in their favor.

Donald Trump lost that election by more than 7 million votes, 306-232 in the electoral college, so then their big lie now has to stretch all the way over January 6. We have to disbelieve the evidence of our own eyes, of our own ears. We saw them come and descend upon this Chamber, this Congress, wounding and injuring 150 of our police officers, breaking people's noses, breaking people's fingers, putting people in the hospital.

Already, they are back on the news with big lies, saying, "No, no, no. It was a tourist visit," like these real tourists up here who have come to watch Representatives in the United States Congress say there is no difference between truth and lies, real tourists who are not beating the day-lights out of our police officers.

So the lie now extends to January 6. Who knows what really happened? Yes, we all saw it. We saw the Vice President of the United States getting chased out of the Chamber with people yelling, "Hang Mike Pence, hang Mike Pence."

We had a bipartisan committee for a year and a half with more than a thousand witnesses, a hundred subpoenaed witnesses under oath, most of them from the Trump White House and the Trump family and Republicans testifying about Trump's plan to overturn the Presidential election and get Pence just to install him in office.

Yet, they are agnostic about: "Well, the truth and lies, who knows what really happened? Who knows?" Yes. Who knows.

They have a perfect bill for you, then. We call it the Putin protection act. That is what it is, the Putin protection act.

The distinguished gentleman from New York explained Putin spent millions of dollars in 2016 to pump propaganda, electoral sabotage, into our political system. He did. Every security agency in the country told us that. We got a bipartisan report from the Senate saying it.

They are agnostic about it. When it comes to Putin, they see no evil, hear no evil, none of it. But we know that it happened.

That is Putin's plan. Why? Putin cannot beat America politically. He can't beat us economically. He can't beat us militarily. Putin can't beat us philosophically. There is one thing he has—the internet. Why? Because we are a wide open country. He says: Let's take advantage of it. Let's go on their social media platform. We will put people who oppose Putin on the internet in jail—which they do. If you send a tweet against Putin, you are going to jail.

If you put out a tweet against his filthy imperialist war, which some of them support in Ukraine, if you put out a tweet against that in Russia, you are going to jail.

He says: Let's take advantage of America's openness. We will take advantage of them, and we are going to put out propaganda. We will lie about when the election is. We will say it is on Thursday when it is on Tuesday. We will tell people to go vote next week, whatever.

That is the genesis of this whole thing. We have our security agencies who alert social media. They say they are putting up fraudulent information on your platform.

Now they come forward and say that the Democrats are trying to—what?—tell the truth. Not Democrats, the gov-

ernment, our paid Federal Government agencies, are trying to tell the social media when foreign malign actors like Russia, China, and Iran are trying to interfere in our elections.

That is what this is about—Putin protection act. They want Putin and Xi to run free over our platforms, and then they want to fine Federal Government employees thousands of dollars if they alert our government to what foreign malign actors are doing.

The whole justification for it is their silly obsession with Hunter Biden's laptop and this New York Post story, which was taken down by Twitter for 1 day 3 weeks before the election as an exercise of their private decision-making.

Then Elon Musk buys Twitter, and he fires six journalists because they disagree with him. They have no problem with that because, of course, it is a private entity. They can do whatever they want. They want to fire journalists, they fire them. They want to take the story down for an hour or a day, they can do that.

Then they want to turn that into the basis for handcuffing the entire Government of the United States so we can't protect ourselves against Vladimir Putin and President Xi? Give me a break.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I also rise to speak in favor of H.R. 140, the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act.

It is unfortunate that this bill is necessary today. We all know why it is necessary.

In the past, the government weighed in on Twitter and Facebook to lean on them to remove certain posts regarding news stories regarding eventually President Biden's son and his interactions with Ukraine, as well as perhaps interactions with regard to China.

The reason the government weighed in this time is because they wanted to make sure that President Biden won the election.

This is a dangerous thing. There is a certain type of government in which the government weighs in on private businesses. The private businesses are able to stay wealthy. The owners of these businesses are allowed to remain billionaires, provided they play ball with orders from the government.

In other words, you give up your freedom; you maintain your wealth. I am afraid that is the type of country we are heading toward.

The scariest thing about this speech is when we looked at the Pew Research Center and found that 65 percent of Democrats apparently support some form of censorship by the government, which is really a scary thing as to where we head.

Soon the day may come in which a majority of Americans—I don't know the breakdown of that 65 percent, how many were young Americans and old

Americans. Apparently, our young Americans are being educated that this is okay, that the government knows best.

Apparently, whether it is on political matters like we had going on with Hunter Biden, I suppose also with regard to things like COVID and treatments for COVID, whatever it is, everybody, now we can marshal the big corporations of America and, under threats of who knows what, we can ask these big businesses, which don't exactly have monopolies but, as a practical matter, you have to use them.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. As a practical matter, you have to use them, and we say: Okay. You are worth a billion dollars, to those who own these companies, but we want you to say such and such.

It is very scary that the type of young people who apparently are voting Democrat in elections don't have a problem with this.

That is why this bill is introduced today. We want to make sure that, in the future, when the government has a preferred opinion, be it on a potential President's relative, be it on a certain treatment for a disease, that the American public will be able to also get the other side of the story, the side of the story the government doesn't want you to know.

That is why it is so scary that the Democratic Party is opposing this and why it is so scary that apparently their base, if this opinion is right, doesn't have a problem with a bunch of smart government bureaucrats deciding which version of the truth you are going to get.

I realize it is difficult, apparently, where your base voter is, for the Democratic Party to vote for this bill.

□ 1600

I hope you vote for it anyway and I hope you correct what the young people have apparently been getting in school, that in a free country, one of the things we should all have is the ability to say what we want. The news you are getting should not be vetted by the government.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, I must commend my colleagues. Everyone is really consistent on the talking points that must have been circulated. Of course, they are not based on evidence, but everybody does seem to believe that somehow the FBI was censoring people on Twitter. Of course, those of us on the Oversight Committee who have sat through the hearings have not seen any of that.

I am also a little bewildered now because what is basically coming out is that my friends on the other side of the aisle apparently don't support law enforcement doing their jobs, don't support the Intelligence Committee doing their jobs to protect our national secu-

rity, to protect our elections, to protect our democracy. Instead, they want to provide an opportunity for alternative facts to get around the internet as fast and as quickly and as unfettered as possible, but I am here to tell you that we Democrats fully support the First Amendment.

Every single one of us observes, adheres, cherishes the First Amendment. That is, in fact, part of the reason why we in the minority on the Oversight Committee have asked the chairman to do some oversight of Michael Cohen, the former President's former personal lawyer, who was jailed in solitary confinement for 16 days by the Trump administration because they did not want him to publish a book.

That is a prohibition on our free speech. That is censorship. That is a violation of free speech. If we want to talk about free speech, that is what we should be talking about, not some phantom issue that doesn't exist about the FBI trying to make sure that our elections remain free and fair and without foreign interference.

Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOOLENAAR). The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, I have now been here for about an hour. I have yet to hear any evidence at all that the FBI has, in any way, censored any one on social media, on Twitter, or otherwise.

What I have heard is a private company has temporarily restricted a false article from appearing on its website based on serious suspicions of its derivation and, in fact, the same basis for that false article, a hard drive, was proven subsequently to have been altered.

The basis of what we are talking about underlying their concern was false, but nevertheless it was still able to be sent around the internet with ample time, and the social media site even apologized for doing it.

This is a bill that, once again, is a solution searching for a problem. Our First Amendment covers everything that is in here, but the effect of this is it would allow foreign countries to jeopardize our national security, to jeopardize our elections, and to, once again, interfere in our democratic process.

That is the only thing that this bill accomplishes and it should be voted down.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chair, the problem I face is that the Federal employees see it as part of their job to censor Americans' First Amendment protected speech on social media and internet platforms, especially if the speech is

misaligned or inconvenient for the administration's political priorities.

This legislation fixes and addresses this problem head-on with a narrow prohibition on the activities of civil servants.

This bill expands the Hatch Act to prohibit Federal employees from using their official authority to censor lawful speech on third-party online platforms. This is the first step toward important work that should be done in this space of addressing the challenges of preserving free speech on the internet for all Americans.

I thank Judiciary Committee Chairman JIM JORDAN and Energy and Commerce Committee Chair CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS for their early support in crafting this very important legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support this necessary bill.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 118-1. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 140

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

*This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act".*

#### **SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL EMPLOYEE CENSORSHIP.**

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:*

##### **"SUBCHAPTER VIII—PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL EMPLOYEE CENSORSHIP**

##### **"§7381. Policy regarding Federal employee censorship**

*"It is the policy of the Congress that employees acting in their official capacity should neither take action within their authority or influence to promote the censorship of any lawful speech, nor advocate that a third party, including a private entity, censor such speech.*

##### **"§7382. Prohibition on Federal employee censorship**

*"(a) IN GENERAL.—An employee may not—*

*"(1) use the employee's official authority to censor any private entity, including outside of normal duty hours and while such employee is away from the employee's normal duty post; or*

*"(2) engage in censorship of a private entity—*

*"(A) while the employee is on duty;*

*"(B) in any room or building occupied in the discharge of official duties by an individual employed or holding office in the Government of the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof;*

“(C) while wearing a uniform or official insignia identifying the office or position of the employee;

“(D) while using any vehicle owned or leased by the Government of the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof; or

“(E) while using any information system or information technology (as defined under section 11101 of title 40).

“(b) EXCEPTIONS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit an employee from engaging in lawful actions within the official authority of such employee for the purpose of exercising legitimate law enforcement functions, including activities to—

“(A) combat child pornography and exploitation, human trafficking, or the illegal transporting of or transacting in controlled substances; and

“(B) safeguarding, or preventing, the unlawful dissemination of properly classified national security information.

“(2) REPORTING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 72 hours before an employee exercises a legitimate law enforcement function to take any action to censor any lawful speech (in this paragraph referred to as a ‘censorship action’), but not including any such action relating to activities described under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1), the head of the agency that employs the employee shall submit, to the Office of Special Counsel and the chair and ranking member of the committees of Congress described under subparagraph (B), a report that includes—

“(i) an overview of the action, or actions, to be taken, including a summary of the action being taken and the rationale for why a censorship action is necessary;

“(ii) the name of the entity which the action is being requested of;

“(iii) the person and entity targeted by the censorship action, including the associated name or number of any account used or maintained by the entity and a description of the specific speech content targeted;

“(iv) the agency’s legal authority for exercising the law enforcement function;

“(v) the agency employee or employees involved in the censorship action, including their position and any direct supervisor;

“(vi) a list of other agencies that have been involved, consulted, or communicated with in coordination with the censorship action; and

“(vii) a classified annex, if the agency head deems it appropriate.

“(B) COMMITTEES.—The committees of Congress described under this subparagraph are the following:

“(i) The Committee on Oversight and Accountability, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

“(ii) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

“(C) CLARIFICATION OF OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The reporting requirements in this paragraph do not apply to the Office of Special Counsel’s advisory and enforcement functions under subchapter II of chapter 12.

“(c) PENALTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An employee who violates this section shall be subject to—

“(A) disciplinary action consisting of removal, reduction in grade, debarment from Federal employment for a period not to exceed 5 years, suspension, or reprimand;

“(B) an assessment of a civil penalty not to exceed \$1,000; or

“(C) any combination of the penalties described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

“(2) APPLICATION TO SENIOR GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.—Paragraph (1)(B) shall be applied by

substituting ‘\$10,000’ for ‘\$1,000’ for any employee who is—

“(A) paid from an appropriation for the White House Office; or

“(B) appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

“(d) ENFORCEMENT.—This section shall be enforced in the same manner as subchapter III of this chapter.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this subchapter—

“(1) the term ‘censor’ or ‘censorship’ means influencing or coercing, or directing another to influence or coerce, for—

“(A) the removal or suppression of lawful speech, in whole or in part, from or on any interactive computer service;

“(B) the addition of any disclaimer, information, or other alert to lawful speech being expressed on an interactive computer service; or

“(C) the removal or restriction of access of any person or entity on an interactive computer service generally available to the public, unless such person or entity is engaged in unlawful speech or criminal activities on such service;

“(2) the term ‘employee’ has the meaning given that term in section 7322;

“(3) the term ‘interactive computer service’ has the meaning given that term in section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)); and

“(4) the term ‘lawful speech’ means speech protected by the First Amendment of the Constitution.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SUBCHAPTER VIII—PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL EMPLOYEE CENSORSHIP

“7381. Policy regarding Federal employee censorship.

“7382. Prohibition on Federal employee censorship.”

(c) INCLUDING CENSORSHIP ACTIVITIES UNDER JURISDICTION OF OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL.—Strike paragraph (1) of section 1216(a) of title 5, United States Code, and insert the following:

“(1) political activity and censorship prohibited under subchapter III and subchapter VIII of chapter 73, relating to political and censorship activities, respectively, by Federal employees;”

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act should be interpreted as prohibiting a lawful action by a Federal agency to enforce a Federal law or regulation, to establish or enforce the terms and conditions of Federal financial assistance, or to prohibit a Federal employee from using an official Federal account on an interactive computer service to communicate an official policy position, and relevant information, to the public, or provide information through normal press and public affairs relations.

(e) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act, or the application of a provision of this Act or an amendment made by this Act to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, and the application of the provisions to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order, except those printed in House Report 118–7. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CLYDE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 118–7.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, after line 16, insert the following and redesignate accordingly:

“(e) REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 240 days after the date of the enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights and the Office of Special Counsel, shall submit to the committees of Congress described in subsection (b)(2)(B) a report evaluating the compliance by the Federal Government with this section, including a description of any action by the head of an agency or department in the executive branch to—

“(A) consult with any third parties about censorship by employees in the executive branch; or

“(B) engage in any activity prohibited under this section.

“(2) SUNSET.—This subsection shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 199, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in support of my amendment to the Protecting Free Speech from Government Interference Act.

As we all know, the First Amendment is the foundation of our Republic. It protects our right to speak, to worship, and to express ourselves without fear of government retribution.

Unfortunately, we have seen an alarming trend of government officials attempting to censor and silence viewpoints with which they disagree, which are frequently conservative viewpoints.

This censorship often takes the form of using private companies to do the government’s bidding, otherwise known as government-by-proxy censorship. The government can pressure or coerce these companies to silence certain viewpoints, effectively bypassing the protections afforded by the First Amendment. This is an egregious violation of our constitutional rights and it must be stopped.

That is why I am proud to offer my amendment, which will strengthen the Protecting Free Speech from Government Interference Act.

My amendment requires the Attorney General to submit an annual report to Congress evaluating compliance with this Act by Federal agencies and employees in the executive branch, including any instances of censorship.

My amendment will shine a light on the Orwellian practice of using taxpayer dollars to suppress speech through leveraging private companies and hold the government accountable

for any attempts to circumvent Americans' First Amendment freedoms.

I thank Chairman COMER for his leadership on this critical issue and for his support of my amendment. Together, we can make sure that the government is held accountable and that our fundamental rights are protected.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting my amendment and the Protecting Free Speech from Government Interference Act.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment that is offered at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, we hear that the gentleman is concerned about the censorship of conservative viewpoints on social media. But we don't hear the same concern when Elon Musk takes over Twitter and immediately takes down the accounts of six journalists that he does not like. There was no other explanation for it, but it certainly sounds exactly like what my Republican colleagues are talking about, horrific censorship on Twitter. But somehow, that is okay.

So the only, then, explanation we get is, oh, well, it wasn't the Federal Government who told Mr. Musk to do that. Yet, it was the Federal Government who told Twitter to—I don't know—stall the Hunter Biden story or whatever we did, whatever they were alleged to do.

Well, the facts don't bear that out. There was actually no effort by the FBI to censor any journalist, any New York Post story, or anything else. But we continue to hear that over and over and over. Unfortunately, the facts don't actually match up with it.

Now, Twitter can do whatever it wants; it is a private company. So we need to have some sort of nexus to the Federal Government. Unfortunately, the facts and the evidence that has so far been developed by the Republican majority on the Oversight and Accountability Committee do not support any of these allegations.

What this amendment will do is continue their effort to undermine our Federal law enforcement, because what this amendment will do is create more bureaucracy, more reports, more time wasted on doing things other than keeping Americans safe and protecting our national security and our democracy.

This is nothing but an effort to have our good men and women in Federal law enforcement be distracted from doing the jobs that they are supposed to do, which is to protect our elections and our democracy from foreign interference, rather than write lengthy reports.

For that reason, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Chair, the gentleman from New York's remarks in

opposition to my amendment are puzzling.

I think my commonsense amendment should pass with broad bipartisan support as it simply requires transparency and accountability via the mechanism of a report to Congress. That is not a novel idea. It is actually a very good one. It keeps the average American citizen informed.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

The Protecting Free Speech from Government Interference Act ensures that this new prohibition on government censorship is enforced in the same way as the Hatch Act.

My colleague, Mr. CLYDE's, amendment provides much-needed oversight of the implementation and enforcement of this new prohibited Federal employee activity. The amendment's required annual reports by the Attorney General—to be generated in consultation with the Office of Special Counsel—will help Congress evaluate the governmentwide compliance with this new prohibition.

□ 1615

The Clyde amendment will help create transparency and provide Congress valuable insight into any violations of this prohibition of government censorship. I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia working with the committee on his amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

I thank my friend from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) for his support for my amendment to the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act.

It is clear that this should be a bipartisan issue, and we must come together to protect Americans' fundamental right of free speech.

My Democrat colleague on the other side of the aisle's opposition to my amendment is disappointing but not surprising. The Democrats have consistently shown that they are willing to use any means necessary to censor speech with which they disagree, whether it is through government officials or private companies. My amendment simply requires transparency and accountability from the executive branch, and I fail to see how anyone can be opposed to that.

Again, I urge all my colleagues to support my amendment to the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act. We must take a stand against government-by-proxy censorship and ensure that the First Amendment is upheld for all Americans.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, it is funny to hear about how the Democrats are colluding in order to censor free speech on social media when the administration in control of

the Federal Government at the time of the alleged horrific censorship that my Republican colleagues are citing was a Republican administration.

It was the administration of President Donald Trump in October of 2020 when the Hunter Biden laptop story was paused for 24 to 48 hours. Yet, somehow, I gather that the FBI is supposed to be a Democratic-leaning organization and agency doing the Democrats' bidding. Well, you could have fooled me back in 2016 when the Director of the FBI announced 10 days before the election that he was reopening an investigation into the Democratic candidate for President while an investigation was also ongoing into the Republican candidate for President and yet that remained quiet. Explain to me how that is the FBI doing the bidding of the Democrats.

This whole thing, this amendment and this bill, have no place in this Congress. The amendment would just simply add more burdensome bureaucracy to what is already a fruitless effort of a bill. Therefore, we oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 118-7.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 8, strike "and" and insert "or".

Page 3, line 9, strike "safeguarding, or preventing," and insert "safeguard, or prevent".

Page 3, line 10, insert a comma after "of".

Page 6, line 14, strike the semicolon and insert a period.

Page 6, strike lines 15 and 16 and insert the following:

"(d) ENFORCEMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (c)(2), this section shall be enforced in the same manner as subchapter III of this chapter.

"(2) APPLICATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including section 1215(b), the Special Counsel may, in lieu of sending a report to the President under section 1215(b), seek civil monetary penalties under subsection (c)(2) pursuant to section 1215(a). This paragraph shall not be construed to limit or otherwise affect the President's authority to enforce any disciplinary action against an employee described under subsection (c)(2)."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 199, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment makes minor enhancements to this important piece of

legislation that were brought to our attention after our markup.

First, this amendment makes a few technical drafting edits. Second, this amendment clarifies the enforcement section of this legislation with the conforming edit to ensure that the U.S. Office of Special Counsel has the specific authority necessary to carry out the enforcement provisions this legislation establishes for senior government officials.

With this technical change to the special counsel's enforcement capabilities, we are ensuring that the real penalties we have introduced for senior officials can be carried out. We must ensure that senior officials will not escape accountability when they engage in government censorship prohibited by H.R. 140. This will help deter government employees.

Further, this amendment clarifies that the OSC can enforce a civil monetary fine of up to \$10,000 against senior officials, as clearly intended by the text we reported out of committee.

Mr. Chair, I ask for my colleagues' full support of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a technical amendment. It doesn't make much of a difference to what is already a bad bill.

But it is interesting to me that this amendment was allowed to come to the floor, and so many amendments from the Democrats, which actually made meaningful substantive changes to this bill, were not allowed to come to the floor.

Now, we have heard a lot over the past 2 months of this Congress about how the Republican majority is going to do things differently, that they are going to have open rules so that everybody can offer amendments on the floor. But what is clear is that the open rules, I suppose, only apply to the Republican Party. They don't apply to the Democratic Party.

What is upsetting about that, at least for me personally, is I had an amendment that I had also offered in the Rules Committee last night to include an exception not just for child trafficking, child exploitation, human trafficking, and drug trafficking, but also for foreign interference in our elections so that our law enforcement could actually do the work that is needed to protect our democracy, to protect our elections.

This is not some fanciful idea that this bill is actually addressing, a non-existent problem where the FBI is not actually even censoring people. No, that amendment had to do with two charged indictments of Russians in 2016 for interfering in our election. There is actual evidence to support that amend-

ment. Yet, my Republican colleagues did not even allow it to come to the floor.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, I just want to echo the very important point you just made. We have a sequence of trivial amendments that have been added by the majority, and they refuse to consider what I think is the central amendment that this legislation would need in order for it not to be an utter disaster for America if this legislation were to pass.

Now, they concede implicitly by their legislation that there is a problem with saying we are not going to allow any government officials to get in touch with the social media, because they create an exception for certain things: for child pornography, for human trafficking, and for drug dealing. And I agree with all of those. But are those more important and more grave than the national security interests of the United States itself?

What about assaults on our elections, which go right to the heart of national security? What about assaults on our energy security structure? What about assaults on our power structure? Not only do they not build that into their bill; they will not even allow us to put it on the floor for an open vote among all of our colleagues in Congress.

Why won't they do that? Well, because if there is a national security exception to their Putin protection act, at that point, the exception swallows the rule, because the rule is let's let Putin and Xi and every autocrat, theocrat, and dictator on Earth run amuck on our social media and not allow our government officials to say anything about it. That is the effect of this legislation.

I thank Mr. GOLDMAN for yielding.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chair, I just want to reiterate this. This bill protects the First Amendment rights for American citizens. My colleagues would like us to believe that by protecting an Americans' right to say whatever lawful speech they want, we are empowering Russia and China. It is just not true.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Chair, I think this amendment and the chairman's comments are very telling. Of course nobody objects to protecting the free, lawful speech of any American from the Federal Government. That is the First Amendment. But what this bill does is it creates a tremendous barrier to our law enforcement intelligence community and national security apparatus from protecting Americans from all sorts of illicit, malign activity that occurs on social media.

So by preventing us from bringing our substantive, thoughtful amendments to the floor for a vote, what this

bill is ultimately doing, the net effect of it, even if it is not the intent of it, is that it is allowing foreign actors to interfere in everything that happens in our democracy, including our elections.

Now, why does this matter? Why would it matter? Well, because we all know the special counsel definitively proved that Russia interfered in the 2016 election to help Donald Trump win. And the Trump campaign welcomed that interference and used it for their benefit. If you disagree, go look at Special Counsel Mueller's report. That is what is called conclusions based on evidence, not what this bill is.

Mr. Chair, for that reason, we oppose this amendment as well as the underlying bill itself.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NORTH CAROLINA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 118-7.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, beginning on line 25, strike paragraph (1) and insert the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit an employee from engaging in lawful actions against unlawful speech within the official authority of such employee for the purpose of exercising legitimate law enforcement functions.”

Page 3, line 15, after “function”, insert “under paragraph (1)”.

Page 3, line 16, strike “lawful” and insert “unlawful”.

Page 3, line 17, strike “but” and all that follows through line 24 and insert the following: “and consistent with subparagraph (D), the head of the agency that employs the employee shall submit, to the Office of Special Counsel and the chair and ranking member of the committees of Congress described under subparagraph (B), a report that includes—”.

Page 5, after line 19, insert the following:

“(D) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN ACTIONS.—

“(i) Any censorship action relating to combating child pornography and exploitation, human trafficking, or the illegal transporting of or transacting in controlled substances shall be exempt from the reporting requirement under this paragraph.

“(ii) With respect to any censorship action related to safeguarding, or preventing the unlawful dissemination of, properly classified national security information, subparagraph (A) shall be applied by substituting ‘Not later than 72 hours after’ for ‘Not later than 72 hours before’.”

Page 5, line 6, before “and the”, insert “the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.”.

Page 5, line 11, before “and”, insert “Select Committee on Intelligence.”.

Page 7, line 14, strike “and”.

Page 7, beginning on line 16, strike “Constitution.” and insert “Constitution; and”.

Page 7, after line 17, insert the following:

“(5) the term ‘unlawful speech’ means speech not protected by the First Amendment of the Constitution.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 199, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I am grateful that the chairman and lead sponsor will, I anticipate, lend his support to this amendment. It will close a loophole that would defeat the purpose of the bill. In fact, absent this amendment, the bill would inadvertently validate the very conduct this bill aims to stop.

Emerging evidence, most notably the Twitter files, depicts what one expert has termed the largest censorship program in U.S. Government history. On the pretext of protecting election infrastructure or enforcing the Foreign Agents Registration Act, personnel of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, CISA; the Department of Homeland Security, DHS; the FBI, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence; the CIA; the Global Engagement Center from the State Department, which most Americans had never heard of; and even the CDC practically embedded themselves with operators of social media platforms and corporate media to manage and curate Americans’ public discourse, to induce Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, Instagram, et cetera, to take down lawful and First Amendment protected speech of Americans time and again and again.

In so doing, these omnipresent Federal agencies established working relationships with a small cadre of supposed internet research groups, affiliated in some cases with well-known universities and NGOs, but loaded with political partisans, who purported to create black-box analytical efforts to identify social media accounts that amplified content from Russia.

But these purported experts, like Hamilton 68, didn’t identify Russian-amplifying bot networks, as they claimed, through some sophisticated algorithm. They just found a bunch of American Trump supporter accounts and labeled them that. And for months and months, as they became a trusted source for media that cited Hamilton 68, Twitter “trust and safety executives” like Yoel Roth stood quietly by knowing that Hamilton 68 was a fraud.

□ 1630

Guess what? Follow the money. Part of the working relationship between the agencies and the research groups was funding that flowed by the millions in government grants. Each day, it becomes clearer that between these three pillars—Federal security agencies, media operators, and internet analysts—a new Washington revolving door has emerged to facilitate the same people moving between them and profiting from the scam.

The base text of this bill would allow exactly this process to continue, but there is never a legitimate law enforcement purpose for Federal agents to take down speech that the First Amendment protects.

We have now seen agencies of the Federal Government once again targeting Americans for their political views. In the government’s attempt to stop Russian misinformation, they have targeted and attacked Americans for simply voicing opinions that they disfavor. Their actions violate our First Amendment principles, and Congress must take this action to stop it.

The amendment will address the flaw in the bill, but it is odd to me that Democrats who used to so revere the First Amendment are no longer concerned about it. In *Lamont v. Postmaster General* in 1965, which Democrats lauded, the Court held that Americans have a right to receive communist propaganda from abroad. The Democrats loved it then. Now, they don’t even want Americans to be able to post their views on social media. How abhorrent.

We will fix it. This bill will fix it. The amendment will fix the bill.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, my esteemed colleague from North Carolina says that lawful speech on the internet should never be prohibited by Federal agencies, by the government. We agree. It is called the First Amendment. It has existed long before H.R. 140 was written.

What H.R. 140 does and what this amendment does even further is it makes it impossible for unlawful speech to actually be policed. What the private companies do not have is access to the intelligence agency information, national security information, law enforcement information that can determine whether or not the speech that is on the internet is being used in furtherance of crimes or is in and of itself a crime.

They recognize this because there is an exception. There is an exception to this prohibition on law enforcement agencies or Federal Government agencies from actually communicating with social media.

There is an exception for child pornography, human trafficking, and drug trafficking. I gather this amendment also deals with obscenity, but I think it is trying to close this loophole.

Clearly, there is a recognition that law enforcement needs to coordinate to some degree with our social media sites. What this law does is that, but for those very narrow categories, law enforcement has to wait 72 hours.

Everything is around the internet and over again many times within 72 hours. It is an exception that eats the

rule. There is no way that law enforcement can do its job because of this bill.

One would say if you were correct and if there were actual prohibition and censorship of lawful speech that was going on, and if you could show us evidence of that, then maybe one could imagine that a congressional bill was warranted and necessary. Of course, we have none of that. All we have are allegations without any facts or evidence.

We have people who have clearly not read the Twitter files talking about the Twitter files. What we don’t even hear about is all the evidence that Twitter algorithms actually promoted conservative voices more than they promoted Democratic voices.

If this amendment, as I understand it, restricts law enforcement’s ability to coordinate with social media sites to protect the public, prosecute crimes, investigate crimes, protect our national security, and protect our infrastructure, then I oppose this amendment because it makes a bad bill even worse.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

The Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act prohibits Federal employees from censoring lawful speech while ensuring that the government can still protect American citizens and enforce the law. It does this by narrowly exempting lawful actions to exercise legitimate law enforcement functions from the prohibition on censorship.

These are lawful actions to suppress unlawful speech, such as child pornography, the illegal transportation of controlled substances, or preventing the unlawful dissemination of properly classified national security information.

My colleague’s amendment further clarifies the initial intent of this exemption while preserving the bill’s reporting requirement to provide Congress timely reports on any lawful actions taken by agencies under this exemption.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for his engagement on this important issue.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 118-7.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Congresswoman VIRGINIA



Foxx, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 19, strike “; or” and insert “;”.  
Page 2, line 22, strike the period and insert “; or”.

Page 2, after line 22, insert the following:  
“(F) while the employee is engaged in activities for which official time is authorized under section 7131 of this title.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 199, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise to offer Dr. Foxx' amendment to prohibit censorship while acting as an employee performing activities under taxpayer-funded time. We want to prohibit censorship while you are acting as an agent of the Federal Government using taxpayer dollars.

Public-sector unions already make liberal use of the so-called official time policy—in my opinion, to the detriment of the American people. That is not what this is about.

However, it is important to get a context here of how much time we are talking about. Take the Department of the Treasury, which houses the IRS. In fiscal year 2019—going back a few years—employees spent nearly 350,000 hours receiving taxpayer funds while doing and conducting union activities.

I know in our office, especially during the pandemic, we often had to intervene with the IRS on behalf of our constituents who couldn't get their refunds back and couldn't get answers. Yet, 350,000 hours were used by these same people.

Mr. Chair, that is the equivalent of 40 years of time in 1 year conducting union activities. Those are the 350,000 hours that the employees at the IRS are not answering taxpayer inquiries.

Let's look at the Department of Veterans Affairs. VA employees spent over 500,000 hours in 1 year wheeling and dealing for their own union interests while our Nation's veterans stood in line. We have heard about the waiting list and the backlog. I don't know, maybe we can do something with that 500,000 hours, which is 57 years accumulated in 1 year.

We are not here to talk about these excesses. We are here to talk about censorship being conducted while on official government time. While I object to the entire practice, I hope even my colleagues who support taxpayer-funded lobbying can agree that those employees should be expressly prohibited from censoring the American people while on official time. That is it.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, it is unclear to me at all why this amendment is here because Federal officials are not allowed to censor lawful speech in their official capacity, which is also what the bill says. This is a completely redundant, unnecessary amendment, I suppose designed to rail against public service unions.

I do find it odd that the gentleman refers to the IRS not being able to respond to calls from Americans seeking help with their taxes when one of the very first bills that the majority passed would have eliminated the increase in IRS employees that was passed as part of the IRA last summer specifically so that the IRS would have enough employees to respond quickly to Americans seeking assistance.

Apparently, we have had a rise of conscience here recognizing that Americans and constituents of all of ours cannot get through to the IRS, which is why the IRA increased the number of agents working at the IRS. Apparently, that is not okay if they are collectively bargaining for fair wages and benefits.

This amendment is completely unnecessary. It is redundant. It makes what is already a bad bill duplicative and superfluous, and therefore, I oppose.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, just to comment before I yield some time, if the bill is redundant, if this isn't happening anyhow, then you shouldn't be opposed because it will affect no one.

Regarding the 87,000 IRS agents, we are not talking about hiring 87,000 process workers to go through claims. We are talking about 87,000 agents to come to your home to investigate you. That is what we oppose.

We want it to be done efficiently, and maybe if they weren't spending so much time on themselves, they could spend time on the American people.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

The Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act ensures that the new prohibition on government censorship is enforced in the same manner as the Hatch Act is currently enforced.

My colleague's amendment further strengthens this enforcement. It enshrines Congress' intent to ensure that the Office of Special Counsel continues to treat employees exercising public-sector union-negotiated official time as official duty time.

Official time is taxpayer funded, and this amendment makes certain the Hatch Act's new censorship prohibition will continue to act to apply to Federal employees on official time.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, part of the problem with having a redundant amendment on the floor is that there were so many important amendments that the Democrats offered that were not even allowed to come to the floor, notwithstanding the purported open rules that Republicans have been so proudly championing this Congress.

One of those amendments would have included in the category of exceptions to this unnecessary bill coordinating between law enforcement and social media companies about neo-Nazis inciting anti-Semitic violence on social media. That amendment was offered in the committee and was unanimously rejected by my Republican colleagues, who apparently believe that neo-Nazis should incite violence against Jews unchecked and unfettered on social media.

□ 1645

Unfortunately, that amendment was also offered and rejected at the Rules Committee last night, and so, therefore, we don't have it here to argue about, and we will not be able to vote about it on the floor. Instead, we are voting on this redundant, unnecessary, and confusing amendment that does nothing to meaningfully change this bill but, instead, is an opportunity to rail against union workers.

For that, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. May I inquire of the time remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERRY. What is awesome, Mr. Chairman, is that finally we can actually have amendments on the floor. We can have debate. Let's face it, as my good friend, my colleague from New York says, he is disappointed that his amendment or some amendment didn't make it through. But for the entire time of Speaker PELOSI's last reign of terror around here where we ran the place like an armed prison camp, there were no amendments on the floor—not one.

The gentleman might not agree with the amendment, he might not agree with the process, but at least the American people's voices are heard because amendments are on the floor now, and we are debating them right now.

This is a good amendment, it is required, and it should be required because we can't have government officials censoring their citizens while using taxpayer dollars to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.



Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. GOOD OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 118-7.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 10, insert “(including any action to enforce a Federal law or regulation addressing obscene matters)” after “regulation”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 199, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would add to the rule of construction a clarification that law enforcement can still enforce current law regarding obscenity matters.

Currently, Federal law prohibits the interstate distribution of obscene visual matter which is not protected speech under the First Amendment. In 2016 President Trump signed the Children's Internet Safety Presidential Pledge, and this pledge sought to protect children from the harms of pornography within the limits of the First Amendment. The pledge also encouraged public-private partnerships to prevent the sexual exploitation of children online.

In 2019 Members of this body, including Representatives JIM BANKS, MARK MEADOWS, VICKY HARTZLER, and BRIAN BABIN, sent a letter to Attorney General Barr requesting the Department of Justice enforce obscenity laws and prosecute the pornography industry.

The harmful effects this terrible industry has on our country cannot be overstated. In fact, at least 16 States have declared pornography a public-health crisis and a threat to society.

According to Fight the New Drug, most kids today are exposed to porn by age 13, and 84 percent of males and 57 percent of females ages 14 to 18 have reported viewing pornography.

Beyond the harm to these children mentally, emotionally, psychologically, and spiritually, exposure of this kind is sadly often connected to sexual violence. One study of hundreds of the most popular scenes in the porn industry found that 88 percent contained depictions of physical violence or aggression, while 49 percent contained depictions of verbal aggression.

The role of the Federal Government is to protect its citizens—particularly its children—and to fight to end sexual exploitation wherever it exists in our country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in combating this terrible evil in our country and support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, this is yet another redundant and unnecessary amendment. It is already presumably included in the exception for child pornography and child exploitation. I suppose if it is adding obscenity to those exceptions, then perhaps there is something there to it.

What really strikes me here is that there was a bipartisan amendment that was offered in the Rules Committee last night that would include an exception for sexual assault, and that was not passed through to the House floor.

If the chairman would indulge me for a moment and I could yield to him, can the gentleman explain why he opposed the bipartisan amendment that would prohibit sexual assault and yet he allowed through this amendment on basic obscenity?

Apparently, the chairman doesn't know what I am referring to.

There was a bipartisan amendment offered last night in the Rules Committee between Congresswoman HOULAHAN and Congresswoman MACE that would have added to the specified list of exceptions to law enforcement coordinating with social media companies in the event of information related to sexual assault.

That amendment was not passed through to the House, and we are not considering it today. Yet, here we are considering the gentleman from Virginia's amendment including as an exception, in the same way, issues related to obscenity and obscene matters.

Now, if my Republican colleagues believe that basic obscenity on the internet is worse than sexual assault, then they should say so. But that seems quite preposterous to me, and it is a shame that we cannot address the bipartisan Houlahan-Mace amendment on the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would hope we would get bipartisan support then for this amendment which does further protect our children and clarify that law enforcement can still enforce current law regarding obscene matters.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Good amendment.

This bill clarifies that Federal agencies are not prohibited from taking lawful actions to enforce our Nation's laws and regulations. My colleague's

amendment clarifies that Federal agencies may still enforce our Nation's laws that combat obscene matters which are not protected by the First Amendment.

This amendment clarifies congressional intent that our Federal agencies must continue working to keep our children safe from the lewd materials so often circulating on the Internet. Protecting our children should be a central focus of this legislative body, and this amendment cements that commitment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the amendment.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let's get this straight. We have an amendment here because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to protect children from obscenity. Yet amendments that the Democrats have offered to protect our national security, to protect our elections from foreign interference, to protect against live-streaming of terrorist events and attacks used by international terrorists around the country to strike fear in Americans and others worldwide, and to an amendment that could protect against sexual assault, none of those amendments are here for us to address today.

Instead, what we are addressing right now is in addition to child pornography and child exploitation—two very legitimate law enforcement purposes that, of course, should be permitted to have coordination with social media companies—no, now we are really worried about protecting children from seeing nudity online.

Apparently, that is of such paramount importance that we don't care if Vladimir Putin has a red carpet to interfere in our elections. We don't care if people are threatening to assault people online and to threaten sexual assault. And we don't care if people are sending death threats online. No. We need to protect our children from seeing some nudity. That is what is so important that we need an amendment on the floor.

The joke of it all—and the gentleman from Pennsylvania commented on how great it is that we are considering amendments—is that apparently it is only great if you are a Republican because only Republican amendments are allowed to be considered on the floor.

That is a travesty. That is not what we were promised. That is not what the American people want to hear. So for all of those reasons, I oppose this unnecessary amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 118-7.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 2(e).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 199, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge the ranking member and the chairman of the important Oversight and Reform Committee and the work that they do to ensure that government agencies work well.

As they do so, I would expect that their efforts would meet all tests of credibility and, as well, the four corners of the Constitution.

I have tried to study this legislation. However, it concerns me, again, because it would make it more difficult for Government agencies to share pertinent information with important stakeholders to keep our country safe.

With no clear exceptions for national security, this legislation would add burdensome and unworkable reporting requirements and a 72-hour waiting period which could be detrimental to our democratic institutions during times when communication is necessary to protect our democracy.

This bill is seeking to limit the lawful activities of Federal law enforcement agencies, and it is a threat to our national security.

All of us stand on this floor and stand shoulder to shoulder with law enforcement. Our firefighters are here on the campus. We stand shoulder to shoulder with them. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, this legislation would not show our confidence in those who have to do the job.

So I offer an amendment that provides a response to the section on severability that keeps the remaining portions of the act in place should a portion of the act or amendment made by the act be held to be unconstitutional. The insertion of such a severability clause in this bill is telling of the complete lack of faith, I believe, in the constitutional viability and credibility this entire bill aims to put forth.

While the general purpose of the severability doctrine clause is used to direct courts on what to do with a statute or a part of it, if a provision is invalidated, Congress is actually discouraged from using express severability clauses given it is unnecessary due to the court's strong presumption in favor of any such need for severability.

Moreover, Congress assumes its laws are constitutional. This should be constitutional. As such, the primary appli-

cation of a severability clause is for the functionality of the statute and whether the surviving provisions are capable of functioning independently.

This is not free speech. The majority is denying our Federal officers free speech to do their job to protect America.

So the included general severability clause in H.R. 140 is not intended to provide clarity to the court on particular specific sections of this bill, but rather, it is an ill attempt to save a poorly written bill and one that steps on the First Amendment rights of our hardworking patriots—our Federal employees—because it is anticipated that this bill may be held unconstitutional.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chairman, this bill is timely and necessary. We have learned just how easy it is for the Federal Government to influence a private company to limit the exercise of First Amendment protected speech.

During a recent hearing on the Twitter files, the Oversight and Accountability Committee heard from a former FBI official and Twitter employee who called for Federal legislation that would reasonably and effectively limit government interactions with private-sector platforms.

Let me be clear: A former FBI official and former Twitter employee endorsed and called for legislation just like this.

This legislation should not be controversial, but the intention of this amendment is to gut this bill. The intention of this amendment is to risk the implementation of this necessary legislation.

□ 1700

The inclusion of the clause this amendment removes is standard legislative practice. All this clause does is make sure that if a court decides to strike down any part of this act, that the rest of the act stays intact. It is that simple.

These clauses have been used in legislation for decades. Including a clause like the one in this legislation is standard practice that ensures that this much-needed and noncontroversial legislation can be faithfully implemented.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN).

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, just briefly, we were at that Twitter hearing when the former gen-

eral counsel of Twitter and of the FBI suggested that there needs to be legislation in order for social media companies to properly coordinate with law enforcement, and we wholeheartedly agree.

I am certain that he would never in a million years imagine that this would be the legislation because this completely guts the FBI's ability to protect the safety and security of the American people and our democracy.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 10 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, let's not pretend the witness at that hearing wants this bill to be the legislation in order for social media and law enforcement to coordinate. I am happy to work with the chairman on that, but it is not this bill.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, let me thank the gentleman from New York for his clarification. He was in the hearing. He heard the witness ask for relief. But I would say that gentleman did not ask to have, at the core of the relief, a legislative initiative rooted in far-right conspiracy theories despite the clear lack of evidence that any Biden administration official violated the First Amendment or censored Americans or social media platforms.

We want to make sure that we are safe and have national security, but at the same time, how are we going to amend the Hatch Act and really shut down those who are involved in law enforcement and national security?

We saw what happened on January 6. We need all of the communications and intelligence that we need, not only to protect our law enforcement but to protect the United States of America.

My amendment is necessary, Mr. Chairman. It is necessary because the court's presumption is that the statute is constitutional. If there is a section that is found unconstitutional, the court will yield to this idea that they will look at it in a manner to discern what are the facts.

My amendment simply says that to put this in the legislation, you are then going to have a guardrail against this bill being found unconstitutional.

With that in mind, I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, which is a clear expression of the law.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Jackson Lee Amendment No. 6 which would strike Section 2, Subsection (e), the severability provision in H.R. 140—the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act.

Subsection (e) of Section 2 in H.R. 140 "provides a severability clause that keeps the remaining portions of the Act in place should a portion of the Act, or an amendment made by the Act, be held to be unconstitutional."

The insertion of such a severability clause in this bill is telling of the complete lack of faith

in the constitutional viability and credibility this entire bill aims to put forth.

While the general purpose of the severability doctrine clause is used to direct courts on what to do with the statute or a part of it, if a provision is invalidated, Congress is actually discouraged from using express severability clauses given it is unnecessary due to the court's strong presumption in favor of any such need for severability.

Moreover, Congress assumes its laws are constitutional. As such, the primary application of a severability clause is for the functionality of the statute and whether the surviving provisions are capable of functioning independently.

To include a general severability clause in H.R. 140 is not intended to provide clarity to the courts on particular or specific sections of this bill, but rather it is an ill attempt to save a poorly written bill that is anticipated to be unconstitutional in part or in whole.

Such a provision does not belong in this legislation and does not comport with traditional intended uses for such a doctrine typically preserved and carefully applied by courts (not legislators) in reviewing statutes in question as to unanticipated functionality or constitutionality concerns.

The entire bill as written is problematic, and such a clause would not save it.

For these reasons, I ask that my colleagues vote yes to the Jackson Lee amendment No. 6 to strike the severability clause of H.R. 140.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 118-7.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 2, strike "5" and insert "10".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 199, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, accountability matters. Our Nation deserves nothing less than full transparency from Federal officials working in the name of the American people.

When government officials abuse their office to infringe on Americans' right to free speech, it is a very grave offense. Government officials who

abuse official taxpayer-funded resources to censor Americans need to be out of government service for a long time.

My amendment allows the Office of Special Counsel, which adjudicates the Hatch Act, and would adjudicate the newly added provisions of this bill, to punish those employees with a longer span of debarment.

This amendment revises the disciplinary action under the bill to allow for debarment from Federal employment for up to 10 years rather than 5. This better reflects the gravity of their offense. People who abuse their official office to violate Americans' constitutional rights shouldn't be able to return to government employment after a brief stint in the private sector.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, accountability matters, says my friend from Tennessee, and his amendment would place further penalties in the hands of the Office of Special Counsel which, as he mentions, is the office that also adjudicates the Hatch Act. Well, if you want accountability, let's start talking about the Hatch Act. Let's talk about the 13 Trump administration officials who violated the Hatch Act. Let's talk about Kellyanne Conway, who had more than 60 violations of the Hatch Act, so many that the Office of Special Counsel—that the gentleman from Tennessee references—recommended that she be fired.

Did anything happen to her? No. You know what she said? She said: Come talk to me when there is a jail sentence. Well, that is why last week in our markup on this bill I introduced the Kellyanne Conway amendment, which would have added criminal penalties for a knowing, willful, and intentional violation of the Hatch Act.

Now, as we all know, the Hatch Act is actually a law that prohibits government officials from abusing their office, as the gentleman from Tennessee just said. Without teeth in those penalties, the Trump administration senior officials ran roughshod all over that.

Unfortunately, what Mr. OGLES and the chairman are focused on is not on adding accountability to prohibit government officials from abusing their positions for political purposes. Instead, we are talking about the phantom problem of government officials abusing their authority to censor free speech, none of which has happened, and yet here we are with so many examples of violations of the Hatch Act, but we are not dealing with that.

We are not dealing with actual evidence, actual facts, actual violations of the law to put accountability, as the gentleman from Tennessee says, and

some teeth into our laws under the jurisdiction of the Oversight Committee to prevent abuse of power by government officials. That is where we should be spending our time, not on this bill and not on this amendment, which already has plenty of punishment for those who are in violation.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, this bill simply empowers the Office of Special Counsel to do better and adjudicate their job.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chair, the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act aims to prevent Federal employees from censoring the lawful speech of Americans.

My colleague's amendment further strengthens the enforcement of this new prohibition on Federal employee actions by increasing the potential debarment penalty from 5 to 10 years.

Increasing this debarment for up to 10 years serves as a strong deterrent to Federal employees and clearly underscores Congress' understanding of the significant harm these censorship activities have done to America's trust in their Federal Government.

We must rebuild this public trust that the Federal agencies Congress is charged with conducting oversight over are operating within the boundaries of their lawful authorities.

Civil servants that extend their duties beyond their legal authority to encroach on the speech rights of Americans do not deserve to serve in our Nation's government.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to appear so tough that 5 years of debarment from Federal employment is not enough, so we are going to make it 10 because 5 just doesn't do it. The difference between 5 and 10 is going to mean that someone, some government official who is trying to censor lawful speech on the internet is going to say, whoa, whoa, 10 years, oh, I am not going to do it now—but 5 years.

These amendments are trivial; they are unnecessary; they have no meaning; and yet the meaningful amendments were not allowed to be brought to the floor.

Apparently the open rules only apply to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they do not apply to us. That is a shame because there are some very significant amendments that would make this bad, bad bill slightly better.

For that reason, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 118-7.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 9, strike "\$10,000" and insert "\$50,000".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 199, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, again, accountability matters. If you are paid from an appropriation for the White House office or appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, you need to be held to a standard of utmost impartiality.

These folks are paid generous salaries and have large platforms as Cabinet Secretaries or senior White House aides. The monetary penalty should reflect their increased responsibility compared to rank-and-file employees.

The American people have had enough of the swamp, and its efforts to infuse authoritarianism into the fabric of American society.

This amendment, which raises the penalty from \$10,000 to \$50,000 for senior officials who abuse their office to violate Americans' constitutional rights deserve a costly penalty.

I urge adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, the problem with these civil penalties is not that it is going to bankrupt any government officials, but it has a tremendous chilling effect on anyone trying to do their job, on any Federal law enforcement or intelligence community official trying to protect our country, trying to enforce our laws, trying to keep Americans safe, trying to keep our democracy safe because what these penalties will do is create an amorphous barrier to this amorphous law where no one has any idea whether what they are doing is lawful or unlawful because who is to define lawful speech?

Well, traditionally, it is a court, and it is government officials who have to make that initial call, that initial discretionary decision whether or not speech is lawful. In what world, if they are risking a \$50,000 fine, are they ever going to take a risk to actually try to do something that might be on the line?

What these penalties will ultimately do is encourage good, upstanding, patriotic American Federal officials not to pursue their jobs, not to do their jobs in the way that we, the American people, need them to do their jobs, in a way that keeps us safe, in a way that enforces our criminal laws, in a way that protects us.

That will not happen because they are going to be fearful that they will lose a third to a quarter of their salary if they violate this H.R. 140.

Why on Earth would anyone take a chance if they are going to lose a third of their salary for an entire year on actually executing their job if they run the risk that someone somewhere is going to say that they stepped over the line and that in retrospect speech that they thought might be in furtherance of a crime wasn't actually in furtherance of a crime, and therefore, they lose their job and they lose a third of their salary?

□ 1715

It has an incredible trickle-down detrimental effect on any Federal official trying to do his or her job. Whether or not you realize that, that is how it is going to be perceived by every hard-working, patriotic American who has decided to go to work for their government.

You may think, my friends on the other side of the aisle, that the real problem here are Federal Government officials. You would be sorely mistaken, because I spent 10 years as a Federal career government official, working alongside every single law enforcement agent we had, and they are all trying to do their best.

What this law will do is it will prevent them from doing their best, and it will jeopardize every American in this country because of it.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to create greater accountability, responsibility, thoughtfulness in these Cabinet secretaries and senior officials so that it is not partisan politics that rules the day, but, rather, the American people—or the interests of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Ogles amendment.

The Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act introduces newly created civil fines for the most senior officials.

My colleague's amendment further strengthens this enforcement penalty for senior officials by increasing the civil monetary fines up to \$50,000.

This \$50,000 will serve as a deterrent to the administration's most senior officials—Senate-confirmed Presidential appointees and the White House staff—to prevent them from censoring the lawful speech of ordinary Americans.

It is especially important that our Nation's most senior leaders are held to a higher level of accountability given their higher level of influence.

I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) for proposing this amendment which preserves the carefully negotiated structure of the bill.

I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALFORD) having assumed the chair, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 140) to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit Federal employees from advocating for censorship of viewpoints in their official capacity, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1731

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOOLENAAR) at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adoption of H. Con. Res. 21; and

Motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 753.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

#### SYRIA WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers

Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Syria, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the concurrent resolution.

This is a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 103, nays 321, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—103

Auchincloss	Espallat	Mills
Balint	Fry	Mooney
Barragan	Gaetz	Moore (WI)
Bean (FL)	Garcia (IL)	Napolitano
Beyer	Garcia, Robert	Nehls
Biggs	Gomez	Norman
Bishop (NC)	Good (VA)	Oberholte
Blumenauer	Gosar	Ocasio-Cortez
Blunt Rochester	Green, Al (TX)	Ogles
Boebert	Greene (GA)	Omar
Bonamici	Griffith	Pallone
Bowman	Hagaman	Perry
Brecheen	Harris	Pingree
Buck	Hern	Pocan
Burchett	Higgins (NY)	Posey
Burgess	Hoyle (OR)	Pressley
Burlison	Huffman	Ramirez
Bush	Hunt	Rosendale
Cammack	Jacobs	Roy
Carson	Jayapal	Sánchez
Casas	Jordan	Santos
Chu	Joyce (PA)	Scanlon
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Cline	Khanna	Schweikert
Cloud	Kildee	Thamendar
Collins	Larsen (WA)	Tiffany
Comer	Lee (CA)	Tlaib
Connolly	Lee (PA)	Tokuda
Crane	Luna	Tonko
Deluzio	Mace	Torres (NY)
DeSaulnier	Massie	Trahan
Dingell	McClintock	Vargas
Doggett	McGovern	Velázquez
Donalds	Meng	
Emmer	Miller (IL)	

NAYS—321

Adams	Cherfilus-	Ferguson
Aderholt	McCormick	Finstad
Aguilar	Cicilline	Fischbach
Alford	Ciscomani	Fitzgerald
Allen	Clark (MA)	Fitzpatrick
Allred	Clyburn	Fleischmann
Amodei	Clyde	Fletcher
Armstrong	Cohen	Flood
Babin	Cole	Foster
Bacon	Correa	Foushee
Baird	Costa	Fox
Balderson	Courtney	Frankel, Lois
Banks	Craig	Franklin, C.
Barr	Crawford	Scott
Beatty	Crenshaw	Frost
Bentz	Crockett	Fulcher
Bera	Crow	Gallagher
Bergman	Cuellar	Galleo
Bice	Curtis	Garamendi
Bilirakis	D'Esposito	Garbarino
Bishop (GA)	Daids (KS)	Garcia (TX)
Bost	Davidson	Garcia, Mike
Boyle (PA)	Davis (IL)	Gimenez
Brown	Davis (NC)	Golden (ME)
Brownley	De La Cruz	Goldman (NY)
Buchanan	Dean (PA)	Gonzales, Tony
Bucshon	DeGette	Gonzalez,
Budzinski	DeLauro	Vicente
Calvert	DelBene	Gooden (TX)
Caraveo	DesJarlais	Gottheimer
Carbajal	Diaz-Balart	Granger
Cárdenas	Duarte	Graves (LA)
Carey	Duncan	Graves (MO)
Carl	Dunn (FL)	Green (TN)
Carter (GA)	Edwards	Grijalva
Carter (LA)	Ellzey	Grothman
Carter (TX)	Escobar	Guest
Cartwright	Eshoo	Guthrie
Case	Estes	Harder (CA)
Casten	Evans	Harshbarger
Castor (FL)	Ezell	Hayes
Chavez-DeRemer	Fallon	Higgins (LA)
	Feenstra	Hill

Himes	McGarvey	Sewell
Hinson	McHenry	Sherman
Horsford	Meeks	Sherrill
Houchin	Menendez	Simpson
Houlihan	Meuser	Slotkin
Hoyer	Mfume	Smith (MO)
Huizenga	Miller (OH)	Smith (NE)
Issa	Miller (WV)	Smith (NJ)
Ivey	Miller-Meeks	Smith (WA)
Jackson (IL)	Molinaro	Smucker
Jackson (NC)	Moolenaar	Sorensen
Jackson (TX)	Moore (AL)	Soto
Jackson Lee	Moore (UT)	Spanberger
James	Moran	Spartz
Jeffries	Morelle	Stansbury
Johnson (GA)	Moskowitz	Stanton
Johnson (LA)	Moulton	Stauber
Johnson (OH)	Mrvan	Steel
Johnson (SD)	Mullin	Stefanik
Joyce (OH)	Murphy	Steil
Kamlager-Dove	Nadler	Stevens
Kaptur	Neal	Stewart
Kean (NJ)	Neguse	Strickland
Keating	Newhouse	Strong
Kelly (MS)	Nickel	Swalwell
Kelly (PA)	Norcross	Sykes
Kiggans (VA)	Nunn (IA)	Takano
Kiley	Owens	Tenney
Kilmer	Palmer	Thompson (CA)
Kim (CA)	Panetta	Thompson (MS)
Kim (NJ)	Pappas	Thompson (PA)
Krishnamoorthi	Pascrell	Timmmons
Kuster	Payne	Titus
Kustoff	Pelosi	Torres (CA)
LaHood	Peltola	Trone
LaLota	Pence	Turner
LaMalfa	Perez	Underwood
Lamborn	Peters	Valadao
Landsman	Pettersen	Van Drew
Langworthy	Pfluger	Van Dwyne
Latta	Porter	Van Orden
LaTurner	Quigley	Vasquez
Lawler	Raskin	Veasey
Lee (FL)	Reschenthaler	Wagner
Lee (NV)	Rodgers (WA)	Walberg
Lesko	Rogers (AL)	Waltz
Letlow	Rogers (KY)	Wasserman
Levin	Rose	Schultz
Lofgren	Ross	Waters
Lucas	Rouzer	Watson Coleman
Luetkemeyer	Ruiz	Weber (TX)
Luttrell	Ruppersberger	Webster (FL)
Lynch	Rutherford	Wenstrup
Magaziner	Ryan	Westerman
Malliotakis	Salazar	Wexton
Mann	Salinas	Wild
Manning	Sarbanes	Williams (GA)
Mast	Scalise	Williams (NY)
Matsui	Schiff	Williams (TX)
McBath	Schneider	Wilson (FL)
McCarthy	Scholten	Wilson (SC)
McCaul	Scott (VA)	Wittman
McClain	Scott, Austin	Womack
McClellan	Scott, David	Yakym
McCollum	Self	Zinke
McCormick	Sessions	

NOT VOTING—11

□ 1756

Messrs. SORESENSEN, DAVIDSON, EVANS, AGUILAR, BABIN, PAYNE, DUNCAN, PETERS, VEASEY, KEATING, VAN DREW, and NADLER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. CARSON, DOGGETT, Ms. TLAIB, Messrs. GARCÍA of Illinois, and THANEDAR changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was not agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed the vote on H. Con. Res. 21. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 136.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably delayed outside of the Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 136.

# DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS CREATION OF ON-SITE TREATMENT SYSTEMS AFFORDING VETERANS IMPROVEMENTS AND NUMEROUS GENERAL SAFETY ENHANCEMENTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 753) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use on-site regulated medical waste treatment systems at certain Department of Veterans Affairs facilities, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 426, nays 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

YEAS—426

Adams	Carson	Donalds
Aderholt	Carter (GA)	Duarte
Aguilar	Carter (LA)	Duncan
Alford	Carter (TX)	Dunn (FL)
Allen	Cartwright	Edwards
Allred	Casas	Ellzey
Amodei	Case	Emmer
Armstrong	Casten	Escobar
Arrington	Castor (FL)	Eshoo
Auchincloss	Chavez-DeRemer	Espallat
Babin	Cherfilus-	Estes
Bacon	McCormick	Evans
Baird	Chu	Ezell
Balderson	Cicilline	Fallon
Balint	Ciscomani	Feenstra
Banks	Clark (MA)	Ferguson
Barr	Clarke (NY)	Finstad
Barragan	Cline	Fischbach
Bean (FL)	Cloud	Fitzgerald
Beatty	Clyburn	Fitzpatrick
Bentz	Clyde	Fleischmann
Bera	Cohen	Fletcher
Bergman	Cole	Flood
Beyer	Collins	Poster
Bice	Comer	Foushee
Biggs	Connolly	Fox
Bilirakis	Correa	Frankel, Lois
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Franklin, C.
Bishop (NC)	Courtney	Scott
Blumenauer	Craig	Frost
Blunt Rochester	Crane	Fry
Bonamici	Crawford	Fulcher
Bost	Crenshaw	Gaetz
Bowman	Crockett	Gallagher
Boyle (PA)	Crow	Galleo
Brecheen	Cuellar	Garamendi
Brown	Curtis	Garbarino
Brownley	D'Esposito	Garcia (IL)
Buchanan	Daids (KS)	Garcia (TX)
Buck	Davidson	Garcia, Mike
Bucshon	Davis (IL)	Garcia, Robert
Budzinski	Davis (NC)	Gimenez
Burchett	De La Cruz	Golden (ME)
Burgess	Dean (PA)	Goldman (NY)
Burlison	DeGette	Gomez
Bush	DeLauro	Gonzales, Tony
Calvert	DelBene	Gonzalez,
Cammack	Deluzio	Vicente
Caraveo	DeSaulnier	Good (VA)
Carbajal	DesJarlais	Gooden (TX)
Cárdenas	Diaz-Balart	Gosar
Carey	Dingell	Gottheimer
Carl	Doggett	Granger

Graves (LA)	Malliotakis	Sánchez
Graves (MO)	Mann	Santos
Green (TN)	Manning	Sarbanes
Green, Al (TX)	Massie	Scalise
Greene (GA)	Mast	Scanlon
Griffith	Matsui	Schakowsky
Grijalva	McBath	Schiff
Grothman	McCaul	Schneider
Guest	McClain	Scholten
Guthrie	McClellan	Schweikert
Hageman	McClintock	Scott (VA)
Harder (CA)	McCollum	Scott, Austin
Harris	McCormick	Scott, David
Harshbarger	McGarvey	Self
Hayes	McGovern	Sessions
Hern	McHenry	Sewell
Higgins (LA)	Meeks	Sherman
Higgins (NY)	Menendez	Sherrill
Hill	Meng	Simpson
Himes	Meuser	Slotkin
Hinson	Mfume	Smith (MO)
Horsford	Miller (IL)	Smith (NE)
Houchin	Miller (OH)	Smith (NJ)
Houlahan	Miller (WV)	Smith (WA)
Hoyer	Miller-Meeks	Smucker
Hoyle (OR)	Mills	Sorensen
Hudson	Molinaro	Soto
Huffman	Moolenaar	Spanberger
Huizenga	Mooney	Spartz
Hunt	Moore (AL)	Stansbury
Issa	Moore (UT)	Stanton
Ivey	Moore (WI)	Stauber
Jackson (IL)	Moran	Steel
Jackson (NC)	Morelle	Stefanik
Jackson (TX)	Moskowitz	Steil
Jackson Lee	Moulton	Stevens
Jacobs	Mrvan	Stewart
James	Mullin	Strickland
Jayapal	Murphy	Strong
Jeffries	Nadler	Swalwell
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Sykes
Johnson (LA)	Neal	Takano
Johnson (OH)	Neguse	Tenney
Johnson (SD)	Nehls	Thanedar
Jordan	Newhouse	Thompson (CA)
Joyce (OH)	Nickel	Thompson (MS)
Joyce (PA)	Norcross	Thompson (PA)
Kamllager-Dove	Norman	Tiffany
Kaptur	Nunn (IA)	Timmons
Kean (NJ)	Obornolte	Titus
Keating	Ocasio-Cortez	Tlaib
Kelly (IL)	Ogles	Tokuda
Kelly (MS)	Omar	Tonko
Kelly (PA)	Owens	Torres (CA)
Khanna	Pallone	Torres (NY)
Kiggans (VA)	Palmer	Trahan
Kildee	Panetta	Trone
Kiley	Pappas	Turner
Kilmer	Pascarell	Underwood
Kim (CA)	Payne	Valadao
Kim (NJ)	Pelosi	Van Drew
Krishnamoorthi	Peltola	Van Dine
Kuster	Pence	Van Dine
Kustoff	Perez	Van Orden
LaHood	Perry	Vargas
LaLota	Peters	Vasquez
LaMalfa	Petterson	Veasey
Lamborn	Pfleger	Velázquez
Landsman	Pingree	Wagner
Langworthy	Pocan	Walberg
Larsen (WA)	Porter	Waltz
Larson (CT)	Posey	Wasserman
Latta	Pressley	Schultz
LaTurner	Quigley	Waters
Lawler	Ramirez	Watson Coleman
Lee (CA)	Raskin	Weber (TX)
Lee (FL)	Reschenthaler	Webster (FL)
Lee (NV)	Rodgers (WA)	Wenstrup
Lee (PA)	Rogers (AL)	Westerman
Lesko	Rogers (KY)	Wexton
Letlow	Rose	Wild
Levin	Rosendale	Williams (GA)
Lofgren	Ross	Williams (NY)
Loudermilk	Rouzer	Williams (TX)
Lucas	Roy	Wilson (FL)
Luetkemeyer	Ruiz	Wilson (SC)
Luna	Ruppersberger	Wittman
Luttrell	Rutherford	Womack
Lynch	Ryan	Yakym
Mace	Salazar	Zinke
Magaziner	Salinas	

## NOT VOTING—8

Boebert	Leger Fernandez
Castro (TX)	Lieu
Cleaver	Phillips

□ 1806

Messrs. STANTON and GARCÍA of Illinois changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### PROTECTING SPEECH FROM GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). Pursuant to House Resolution 199 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 140.

Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1811

### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 140) to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit Federal employees from advocating for censorship of viewpoints in their official capacity, and for other purposes, with Mr. MOOLENAAR (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 8 printed in House report 118-7 offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) had been disposed of.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House report 118-7 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania;

Amendment No. 6 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

### AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the request for recorded vote on amendment No. 4, printed in House Report 118-7 by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 223, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

### AYES—207

Aderholt	Garcia, Mike	Mills
Alford	Gimenez	Moolenaar
Allen	Gonzales, Tony	Mooney
Amodei	González-Colón	Moore (AL)
Armstrong	Good (VA)	Moore (UT)
Arrington	Gooden (TX)	Moran
Babin	Gosar	Moylan
Baird	Granger	Murphy
Balderson	Graves (LA)	Nehls
Banks	Graves (MO)	Newhouse
Barr	Green (TN)	Norman
Bean (FL)	Greene (GA)	Nunn (IA)
Bentz	Griffith	Obernolte
Bergman	Grothman	Ogles
Bice	Guest	Owens
Biggs	Guthrie	Palmer
Billirakis	Hageman	Pence
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Perez
Brecheen	Harshbarger	Perry
Buchanan	Hern	Pfleger
Buck	Higgins (LA)	Posey
Bucshon	Hill	Radewagen
Burchett	Hinson	Reschenthaler
Burgess	Houchin	Rodgers (WA)
Burlison	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Calvert	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)
Cammack	Hunt	Rose
Carey	Issa	Rosendale
Carl	Jackson (TX)	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	James	Roy
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Rutherford
Ciscomani	Johnson (OH)	Salazar
Cline	Johnson (SD)	Santos
Cloud	Jordan	Scalise
Clyde	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Cole	Joyce (PA)	Self
Collins	Kelly (MS)	Sessions
Comer	Kelly (PA)	Simpson
Crane	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Kiley	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Kim (CA)	Smucker
Curtis	Kustoff	Spartz
Davidson	LaHood	Steel
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Stefanik
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Steil
Donalds	Langworthy	Stewart
Duarte	Latta	Strong
Duncan	LaTurner	Tenney
Dunn (FL)	Lee (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Edwards	Lesko	Tiffany
Ellzey	Letlow	Timmons
Emmer	Loudermilk	Turner
Estes	Lucas	Valadao
Ezell	Luetkemeyer	Van Dine
Fallon	Luna	Van Orden
Feenstra	Luttrell	Wagner
Ferguson	Mace	Walberg
Finstad	Mann	Waltz
Fischbach	Massie	Weber (TX)
Fitzgerald	Mast	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	McCaul	Wenstrup
Flood	McClain	Westerman
Foster	McClintock	Williams (TX)
Fox	McCormick	Wilson (SC)
Franklin, C.	McHenry	Wittman
Scott	Meuser	Womack
Fry	Miller (IL)	Yakym
Fulcher	Miller (OH)	Zinke
Gaetz	Miller (WV)	
Gallagher	Miller-Meeks	

### NOES—223

Adams	Bush	Connolly
Aguilar	Caraveo	Correa
Allred	Carbajal	Costa
Auchincloss	Cárdenas	Courtney
Bacon	Carson	Craig
Balint	Carter (LA)	Crockett
Barragán	Cartwright	Crow
Beatty	Casar	Cuellar
Bera	Case	D'Esposito
Beyer	Casten	Davis (KS)
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	Davis (IL)
Blumenauer	Chavez-DeRemer	Davis (NC)
Blunt Rochester	Cerfilus	Dean (PA)
Bonamici	McCormick	DeGette
Bost	Chu	DeLauro
Bowman	Cicilline	DeBene
Boyle (PA)	Clark (MA)	Deluzio
Brown	Clarke (NY)	DeSaulnier
Brownley	Clyburn	Dingell
Budzinski	Cohen	Doggett



Escobar	Lee (NV)	Salinas
Eshoo	Lee (PA)	Sánchez
Espallat	Levin	Sarbanes
Evans	Lofgren	Scanlon
Fitzpatrick	Lynch	Schakowsky
Fletcher	Magaziner	Schiff
Foushee	Malliotakis	Schneider
Frankel, Lois	Manning	Scholten
Frost	Matsui	Schweikert
Gallego	McBath	Scott (VA)
Garamendi	McClellan	Scott, David
Garbarino	McCollum	Sewell
Garcia (IL)	McGarvey	Sherman
Garcia (TX)	McGovern	Sherrill
Garcia, Robert	Meeks	Slotkin
Golden (ME)	Menendez	Smith (NJ)
Goldman (NY)	Meng	Smith (WA)
Gomez	Mfume	Sorensen
Gonzalez,	Molinaro	Soto
Vicente	Moore (WI)	Spanberger
Gotthelmer	Morelle	Stansbury
Green, Al (TX)	Moskowitz	Stanton
Grijalva	Moulton	Staubert
Harder (CA)	Mrvan	Stevens
Hayes	Mullin	Strickland
Higgins (NY)	Nadler	Swalwell
Himes	Napolitano	Neal
Horsford	Neguse	Takano
Houlahan	Nickel	Thanedar
Hoyer	Norcross	Thompson (CA)
Hoyle (OR)	Norton	Thompson (MS)
Huffman	Ocasio-Cortez	Titus
Ivey	Omar	Tlaib
Jackson (NC)	Pallone	Tokuda
Jackson Lee	Panetta	Tonko
Jacobs	Pappas	Torres (CA)
Jayapal	Pascrell	Torres (NY)
Jeffries	Payne	Trahan
Johnson (GA)	Pelosi	Trone
Kamlager-Dove	Peltola	Underwood
Kaptur	Peters	Van Drew
Kean (NJ)	Pettersen	Vargas
Keating	Pingree	Vasquez
Kelly (IL)	Plaskett	Veasey
Khanna	Pocan	Velázquez
Khanna	Porter	Wasserman
Kildee	Pressley	Schultz
Kilmer	Quigley	Waters
Kim (NJ)	Ramirez	Connolly
Krishnamoorthi	Raskin	Correa
Kuster	LaLota	Costa
Landsman	Ross	Courtney
Larsen (WA)	Ruiz	Crockett
Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger	Crow
Lawler	Ryan	Cuellar
Lee (CA)	Sablan	Davids (KS)

## NOT VOTING—10

Boebert	Jackson (IL)	Schrier
Castro (TX)	Leger Fernandez	Steube
Cleaver	Lieu	
De La Cruz	Phillips	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1812

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 138 for H.R. 140, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “aye.” As a strong supporter of unions, I oppose the Perry/Foxo amendment, and I intended to vote “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON  
LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 209, noes 221, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

## AYES—209

Adams	Gomez	Pappas
Aguilar	Gonzalez,	Pascrell
Allred	Vicente	Payne
Auchincloss	Gottheimer	Pelosi
Balint	Green, Al (TX)	Peltola
Barragán	Grijalva	Perez
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Peters
Bera	Hayes	Pettersen
Beyer	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Plaskett
Blumenauer	Horsford	Pocan
Blunt Rochester	Houlahan	Porter
Bonamici	Hoyer	Pressley
Bowman	Hoyle (OR)	Quigley
Boyle (PA)	Huffman	Ramirez
Brown	Ivey	Raskin
Brownley	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Budzinski	Jackson (NC)	Ruiz
Bush	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Caraveo	Jacobs	Ryan
Carbajal	Jayapal	Sablan
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Salinas
Carson	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez
Carter (LA)	Kamlager-Dove	Sarbanes
Cartwright	Kaptur	Scanlon
Casas	Keating	Schakowsky
Case	Kelly (IL)	Schiff
Casten	Khanna	Schneider
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Scholten
Cherfilus-	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
McCormick	Kim (NJ)	Scott, David
Chu	Krishnamoorthi	Sewell
Cicilline	Kuster	Sherman
Clark (MA)	Landsman	Sherrill
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)	Slotkin
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Sorensen
Connolly	Lee (NV)	Soto
Correa	Lee (PA)	Spanberger
Costa	Levin	Stansbury
Courtney	Lofgren	Stanton
Crockett	Lynch	Stevens
Crow	Magaziner	Strickland
Cuellar	Manning	Swalwell
Davids (KS)	Matsui	Sykes
Davis (IL)	McBath	Takano
Davis (NC)	McClellan	Thanedar
Dean (PA)	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	McGarvey	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	McGovern	Titus
DeBene	Meeks	Tlaib
Deluzio	Menendez	Tokuda
DeSaulnier	Meng	Tonko
Dingell	Mfume	Torres (CA)
Doggett	Moore (WI)	Torres (NY)
Escobar	Morelle	Trahan
Eshoo	Moskowitz	Trone
Espallat	Moulton	Underwood
Evans	Mrvan	Vargas
Fletcher	Mullin	Vasquez
Foster	Nadler	Veasey
Foushee	Napolitano	Velázquez
Frankel, Lois	Neal	Wasserman
Frost	Neguse	Schultz
Gallego	Nickel	Waters
Garamendi	Norcross	Watson Coleman
Garcia (IL)	Norton	Wexton
Garcia (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez	Wild
Garcia, Robert	Omar	Williams (GA)
Golden (ME)	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Goldman (NY)	Panetta	

## NOES—221

Aderholt	Bice	Carl
Alford	Biggs	Carter (GA)
Allen	Bilirakis	Carter (TX)
Amodei	Bishop (NC)	Chavez-DeRemer
Armstrong	Bost	Ciscomani
Arrington	Brecheen	Cline
Babin	Buchanan	Cloud
Bacon	Buck	Clyde
Baird	Bucshon	Cole
Balderson	Burchett	Collins
Banks	Burgess	Comer
Barr	Burlison	Craig
Bean (FL)	Calvert	Crane
Bentz	Cammack	Crawford
Bergman	Carey	Crenshaw

Curtis	Jackson (TX)	Ogles
D'Esposito	Johnson (LA)	Owens
Davidson	Johnson (OH)	Palmer
DesJarlais	Johnson (SD)	Pence
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Perry
Donalds	Joyce (OH)	Pfleger
Duarte	Joyce (PA)	Posey
Duncan	Kean (NJ)	Radewagen
Dunn (FL)	Kelly (MS)	Reschenthaler
Edwards	Kelly (PA)	Rodgers (WA)
Ellzey	Kiggans (VA)	Rogers (AL)
Emmer	Kiley	Rogers (KY)
Estes	Kim (CA)	Rose
Ezell	Kustoff	Rosendale
Fallon	LaHood	Rouzer
Feenstra	LaLota	Roy
Ferguson	LaMalfa	Rutherford
Finstad	Lamborn	Salazar
Fischbach	Langworthy	Santos
Fitzgerald	Latta	Scalise
Fitzpatrick	LaTurner	Schweikert
Fleischmann	Lawler	Scott, Austin
Flood	Lee (FL)	Self
Foxo	Lesko	Sessions
Franklin, C.	Letlow	Simpson
Scott	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)
Fry	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Fulcher	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Gaetz	Luna	Smucker
Gallagher	Luttrell	Spartz
Garbarino	Mace	Staubert
Garcia, Mike	Malliotakis	Steel
Gimenez	Mann	Stefanik
Gonzales, Tony	Massie	Steil
González-Colón	Mast	Stewart
Good (VA)	McCaul	Strong
Gooden (TX)	McClain	Tenney
Gosar	McClintock	Thompson (PA)
Granger	McCormick	Tiffany
Graves (LA)	McHenry	Timmons
Graves (MO)	Meuser	Turner
Green (TN)	Miller (IL)	Valadao
Greene (GA)	Miller (OH)	Van Drew
Griffith	Miller (WV)	Van Dwyne
Grothman	Miller-Meeks	Van Orden
Guest	Mills	Wagner
Guthrie	Molinaro	Walberg
Hageman	Mooleenaar	Waltz
Harris	Mooney	Weber (TX)
Harshbarger	Moore (AL)	Webster (FL)
Hern	Moore (UT)	Wenstrup
Higgins (LA)	Moran	Westerman
Hill	Moylan	Williams (NY)
Hinson	Murphy	Williams (TX)
Houchin	Nehls	Wilson (SC)
Hudson	Newhouse	Wittman
Huizenga	Norman	Womack
Hunt	Nunn (IA)	Yakym
Issa	Obornolte	Zinke

## NOT VOTING—10

Boebert	James	Schrier
Castro (TX)	Leger Fernandez	Steube
Cleaver	Lieu	
De La Cruz	Phillips	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1817

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chair, due to illness, I was unable to be present today. Had I been present, I would have voted: “nay” on rollcall No. 134, “nay” on rollcall No. 135, “nay” on rollcall No. 136, “yea” on rollcall No. 137, “nay” on rollcall No. 138, and “yea” on rollcall No. 139.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chair, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HUNT) having assumed the chair, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state

of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 140) to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit Federal employees from advocating for censorship of viewpoints in their official capacity, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF OLA COX

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th birthday of Ola Cox.

Ola is a lifelong resident of Venango County, Pennsylvania, where she continues to make history in her own right over the last century. She has broken gender barriers, supported community endeavors, and brought a global perspective home.

Born in Pittsville, Pennsylvania, Ola graduated high school at 16 years old and enlisted in the Navy WAVES. After returning from naval service during World War II, she married Lester "Boone" Cox and started a family.

Ola continued to break gender barriers as a working mom beside her husband at their Franklin Print Shop. In Ola's 100 years of life, she has countless stories, from their working farm to raising four children.

Following her time in the print shop, she worked at Oakwood Rose Gardens, served as the township tax collector, and frequently volunteered in her community and with her church, the Rockland Methodist Church. She also traveled the world.

Mr. Speaker, Ola is a dedicated wife, mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother. She cared for her dear husband and spent countless hours with her children and great-grandchildren so they could learn and understand the importance of family, community, and the world.

I thank Ola for her service to our country and her dedication to our community.

#### CELEBRATING COLORECTAL CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate March as National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month.

Colorectal cancer is the second leading cause of cancer deaths nationwide, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

This year, more than 153,000 Americans will be diagnosed with the disease, and more than 51,000 people will die from it. Yet, if we catch it early, 90 percent of patients can survive within 5 years.

The key is awareness and education. If we can educate more Americans

about colorectal cancer, we can limit the number of deaths from it. We can remove the fears and stigmas that prevent people from getting screenings.

It is 11 years, 2 days ago, on March 6, that I lost my father, Congressman Donald Payne, Sr., to colorectal cancer.

If more people get screened, we can prevent more families, more fathers, more mothers, more sisters, and more brothers from succumbing from the dreaded disease.

#### PARENTS HAVE SACRED ROLE IN RAISING THEIR CHILDREN

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, parents have a God-given right and role in the raising of their children.

When they send their kids to the public schools, they expect the schools to deliver a quality education to their children in order to prepare them for success in the future. Unfortunately, government schools have abused this trust and have been indoctrinating children with far-left lies and poisoning their minds with woke gender ideology.

School administrators and teachers unions seem to think they own America's children, that they alone have the right to decide what these children think and believe, and that they alone should be the sole authority in a child's life.

Schools across this country have been caught trying to convince vulnerable teenagers that their bodies are wrong, filling their heads with lies and convincing them to see their parents as enemies. This line of thinking is morally wrong.

In my own district, a school district is being sued by a parent for secretly changing her daughter's pronouns and identity without her parent's knowledge or consent. Woke administrators have no moral authority to experiment with children's minds in this way.

Parents have a moral right to be involved in their children's education and should never be kept in the dark about issues that their child is going through at school.

Congress must take action to enshrine parental rights over their children.

□ 1830

#### CONGRATULATING EWING TOWNSHIP GIRLS' BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my alma mater, Ewing High School, on winning the NJSIAA 2022-2023 Group 3 girls' basketball championship—and their first State title in 24 years.

Their hard-fought victory comes after months of diligent work, consistent growth, and exceptional achievement.

I hope this big win instills in them the confidence and determination to succeed in any challenge that comes their way. There is no obstacle that these young women cannot overcome.

I hope head coach Dan Montferrat and the girls' basketball team are celebrating their accomplishment and enjoying this exciting time.

I wish Ewing High School all the best, and, as always, go Blue Devils.

#### OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

(Mr. BEAN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, I had the chance to visit the southern border for the very first time. It was truly educational.

I thank the people of southeast Texas who showed me the true impact of what it means to have an open border.

President Biden and his administration officials continue to tell the American people that the border is secure.

Tell that to the families of two Americans who were killed this week by a Mexican cartel.

Tell that to the record number of parents who have lost kids toentanyl that was brought over the border.

Tell that to the countless public officials we met on that trip who were pleading with us to say that they are just overloaded. Their facilities are overcapacity, and they need help.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to the border, and tonight I am here to tell you that it is not secure.

Mr. Speaker, you know that it is not just a Texas problem; it is America's problem. We need to secure the border. Our national security depends on it.

#### INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY TRAILBLAZER: BESSIE COLEMAN

(Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on International Women's Day to honor a trailblazer.

Mr. Speaker, Bessie Coleman inspired women to reach for their dreams just as she did soaring through the skies as the first African-American and first Native-American woman pilot. She continued to follow her dreams no matter how often those around her told her not to or to find a different path.

She wanted to be a role model so that future generations of women are inspired to accomplish whatever they set their minds to accomplish.

Because of Ms. Coleman, 21 women at Elizabeth City State University, located in my district, now have hands-on flight simulation, interactive panel

conversations, aviation program tours, and more as part of the Bessie Coleman Aviator Academy for Women.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, was inspired by Bessie Coleman. We must continue to celebrate and cherish Ms. Coleman for all she has done and for her contributions to women's history and American history.

#### HONORING LIEUTENANT RUTH COUGHLIN, TENNESSEE'S SECOND DISTRICT'S MARCH 2023 VETERAN OF THE MONTH

(Mr. BURCHETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Lieutenant Ruth Coughlin, an American hero who served in the Navy faithfully from 1953 to 1958.

Lieutenant Coughlin was born in Spartanburg, South Carolina. After high school, she went to St. Vincent's Hospital in Birmingham, Alabama, where she graduated as a registered nurse. From 1944 to 1953, she worked in private practice in ophthalmology and oral surgery practices.

In 1953, she joined the Navy as a Lieutenant Junior Grade and was stationed in Maryland at Bethesda Hospital. During her career she served as a nurse aboard a medical ship that made 32 round trips crossing the Atlantic Ocean from Brooklyn, New York, to north Germany. In 1957, she was reassigned to the U.S. Naval Hospital in Corona, California, where she met her husband, Dennis.

They moved to Knoxville and raised five children together. She will be turning a very young 100 years old this month. I think it is very appropriate during International Women's Day that we honor her.

So happy birthday, Ruth.

Our country's heroes are the men and women of our Armed Forces, like Lieutenant Ruth Coughlin, who has dedicated her life to the service of her country. It is my honor to recognize Lieutenant Coughlin as the Tennessee Second District's March 2023 Veteran of the Month.

#### FACTS ABOUT OUR DEBT CEILING

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lay out a few facts about the debt ceiling.

Raising the debt ceiling is about meeting obligations the government has already made and has nothing to do with new spending.

Since World War I, we have raised the debt ceiling under every single President—every single President.

So let's remember a few facts: The national debt under the Trump administration rose significantly by \$8 trillion, a total of roughly 25 percent of

the entire debt at the time he left office. That is one-quarter of the entire debt by President Trump.

Republicans voted three times—three times—to raise the debt limit under the Trump administration.

So where was the Republican outrage then?

President Biden has lowered the deficit by \$1.7 trillion during the first 2 years of office and has a plan to reduce it even more.

Mr. Speaker, yet House Republicans used their very first bill to hand a giveaway to big corporations and billionaires that cheat on their taxes, adding an explosive \$114 billion to the deficit, and still no plan to reduce debt. House Democrats put people over politics, solutions over rhetoric.

#### HIRZEL CANNING COMPANY AT 100 YEARS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say hurray and recognize a northwestern Ohio institution, Hirzel Canning Company and Farms, on its 100th anniversary.

Headquartered in Northwood, Ohio, the Hirzel family rose from humble beginnings to become a major player in the national canned produce market, particularly canned tomato products. They are the best you will ever eat.

Carl Hirzel was a Swiss immigrant who lost his job as a brewer during Prohibition and moved to northwest Ohio to find opportunity. In 1923, he began farming a 60-acre plot in what is now Northwood.

He initially had trouble selling fresh products in the established produce market, until a local butcher who liked his sauerkraut told him there was an untapped canned vegetable market.

As their CEO, Joe Hirzel, always says, "Whatever you guys do, do not forget quality." That is the Hirzel way.

So today with plants in Northwood, Pemberville, and Ottawa, and a farming operation near Luckey, Hirzel now distributes in 36 States nationwide. Their company is top quality, grown right in northern Ohio, and especially top quality are the people who operate and work there.

I just want to congratulate Hirzel again. Our entire region is so very, very proud of them and all of their accomplishments.

#### SYRIA WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

(Ms. OMAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support Congress' restoring its constitutional authority over matters of war and peace.

No matter what else we are discussing here today, the plain and simple truth is that Congress has not au-

thorized military presence in Syria. For far too long, we in Congress have neglected this key Article I responsibility.

If my colleagues believe that we need the military in Syria, then they should author an AUMF. They should debate that in committee, and they should bring it to a vote on the floor. We must not continue to hand over power to the executive branch when the politics get too difficult.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support today's resolution.

#### IRAN STUDENT POISONINGS

(Ms. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, schools aren't battle zones, but Iranian students are caught in the crossfire.

In recent months, a chain of chemical attacks have hit Iran's schools. Although the motive is unclear, girls and young women have been the clear target. Hundreds of schoolgirls have been poisoned, and an 11-year-old was killed.

As a mother, I share the anger and frustration of every parent too fearful to send their kids to class.

Iranians deserve answers and accountability, but their government remains silent. The regime cares more about covering up these attacks than stopping them. Iranian authorities have falsified medical reports and spread disinformation. They have even intimidated parents of victims to keep their stories from the press.

I stand with these parents demanding a full investigation and a quick end to these attacks. The United States must stand with them and every Iranian demanding a future free of violence.

#### DEMOCRATIC AND SAFE ELECTIONS IN NIGERIA

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor where I am always reminded of the privileges of this Nation. That is why we fight so hard to end voter suppression, oppression, and the denial of the right to vote.

This institution is the cradle of democracy. This past weekend we were in Selma, Alabama, where really the first start of democracy and the right to vote was reignited in the 20th century.

As Nigeria, our ally and friend, begins to look at its national elections, I call upon the Nigerian diaspora to insist on democratic and safe elections and to be assured that the count is accurate and that the people's voices are counted.

As the chair of the Nigerian Caucus in the United States Congress, I must insist that our ally gives the same rights and privileges that we fight for in the United States: the unfettered right to vote and for the vote to count.

The fact is that the vote is your birth-right and it is your voice.

I hope that the Nigerian Government and all of those in the Nigerian diaspora will stand for democracy and the right to an unfettered vote in the Nigerian elections.

### OUR NATION'S ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am going to pause here for 5 seconds, and I will tell you why.

I did that to note something. I did that because I want to note that our Federal Government just spent \$1 million in 5 seconds—\$1 million. By the time I finish this speech, the government will have spent over \$50 million. By the time my colleagues finish their speeches, that figure will be in the hundreds of millions.

As it stands right now, our government is spending \$197,000 per second, which as a recent publication by the America First Policy Institute points out, is faster than the speed of light.

Let's look at this graphic here real quick.

My staff just ran this up on the copy machine because I wanted to blow it up. This is a post by the AFPI. They point out the fastest things on the Earth, and they note that we are actually spending right now faster than the speed of light. The speed of light is 186,282 miles per second. We are spending \$197,000 per second.

Our national debt is well over \$31 trillion right now—\$31 trillion.

Now, if those figures alarm you, Mr. Speaker, you are not alone. Everybody on our side of the aisle is deeply concerned about this. We understand what a risk it is to our national security and to the stability of our constitutional Republic.

□ 1845

However, you won't find anyone—hardly anyone, I think—on the other side of the aisle who understands this or agrees with it. I mean, based upon their voting records, based upon their proposals to continue to raise taxes and raise spending, based upon some of the speeches they gave here on the floor tonight, they don't get it, and neither does the mainstream media. That ought to be of even greater concern to you.

Earlier this month, the Congressional Budget Office released a frightening report. All Members of Congress in a bipartisan fashion met in the congressional auditorium this afternoon to hear the CBO Director relay some of this really frightening information.

It is about our economic outlook. If you haven't heard about it yet, it is because really the media is not covering this. The 24-hour news cycle buries it for the next big thing, but there is hardly anything bigger than this.

Let me give you a couple of the highlights that came out of that briefing this afternoon:

Number one: Net interest on our national debt will reach \$10.5 trillion over the next decade.

Now, I know these numbers are big and it is sort of hard to grasp them, but you think about \$10.5 trillion over the next 10 years. For reference, listen to this: since 1940 the total net interest payments on our national debt has been \$12.9 trillion, adjusted for inflation. Since 1940.

In the next 10 years, we are going to spend \$10.5 trillion just on interest alone. It is staggering. Our national debt is going to reach \$154 trillion by 2053—\$150-plus trillion. That equals \$540,000 per household when you adjust for inflation. That is more than four times the current median household income.

Deficits are going to average—average—\$2 trillion annually, or 6.1 percent of our gross domestic product over the next 10 years. The government had a lower deficit than this every single year from 1945 to 2009. The cost of the annual interest will balloon from \$350 billion to \$1.4 trillion in just a decade. That is 20 cents of every tax dollar that is collected by this Federal Government is going to go to paying interest on America's debt.

Mr. Speaker, we are in uncharted economic waters. We have never seen anything like this. Our country has only faced an economic threat like this during times of war and pandemic. If you only listen to the media and Democrat politicians, all of our colleagues over here, you would think there is really no issue at all.

I mean, the Biden administration continues to portray this rosy outlook. They were saying it today: the state of the economy isn't so bad. We are doing well. We are trending in the right direction, they say. That is absolutely not true.

The CBO, by the way, is a non-partisan entity. They don't choose a side. They just came in and presented the objective facts to Republicans and Democrats because we want to make everybody face this harsh reality.

President Biden has touted that his administration "cut \$1.7 trillion of the deficit." He says that is evidence that he is really serious about the national debt, but that is obviously fiction as well. That reduction naturally occurred with the statutory end of the increased spending that Congress ap-

proved to combat COVID-19. That wasn't because of any shrewd economic policy from the White House. It is exactly the opposite.

Speaking of economic madness, you know, tomorrow the President is expected to release his 2023 budget proposal. It is more than a month late. Every news report, all the early ones, suggest that his budget is replete with trillions of dollars in new taxes, raising taxes in the middle of an inflation crisis that he created; more spending on frivolous, liberal pet policies and projects and no plan at all to reduce the deficit.

For the first time in his Presidency, he won't have a Democrat rubber stamp over here. He won't have the Democrats in charge of this House to go along with that destructive agenda.

Mr. Speaker, the American people made their voices heard when they gave Republicans control of this House, and we are going to do our job. They have entrusted our new majority to provide a much-needed check on the Biden administration, and that starts with the power of the purse.

Over the next few months, the discourse around here is going to intensify. There is going to be some heated debate. It is likely to get off track with squabbles about everything from defense spending to earmarks, but House Republicans will not lose sight through this of the bigger picture. We are going to rein in spending and inflation because we must. We are going to promote responsible budgeting because we must. We are going to chart our country on a course back to fiscal sanity. It is the duty of every Member of this body to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to a number of my colleagues tonight who will participate in this Special Order hour, talking about lots of important things on the hearts and minds of the American people. I just want to suggest that the debt is one of those.

Mr. Speaker, I yield first to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER), my dear friend.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman JOHNSON for hosting this Special Order.

The American agriculture industry powers our economy and feeds the world, but President Biden wants to burden farmers and landowners with higher taxes and more red tape with his disastrous waters of the United States rule.

Farmers and ranchers do not want to be told how to use and regulate their land by Biden's radical Cabinet Secretaries. I introduced a bill called Define WOTUS Act with Senator BRAUN to protect my fellow farmers and stand against the disastrous Biden EPA, which is working to regulate every pond and puddle in America. Our Nation's farmers, ranchers, and property owners come last in the Biden agenda.

This week, I will proudly stand with House Republicans to pass legislation ending Biden's disastrous WOTUS rule.

We are going to put American farmers first. It is my privilege to advocate for my fellow Illinois farmers on the House Agriculture Committee and represent our needs in Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for highlighting that really important issue. The WOTUS rule has gotten completely out of control.

Mr. Speaker, I yield next to the gentleman from New York (Mr. D'ESPOSITO), one of our new Members to Congress.

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that radical criminal justice legislation passed by the Washington, D.C. Council appears to be headed for defeat, thanks to widespread rejection by House Republicans.

The legislation in question, known as the revised Criminal Code Act of 2022, eliminates mandatory minimum sentences for a long list of crimes, while also reducing maximum sentences for things like first-degree burglary, armed burglary, and first-degree sexual assault.

This law being advanced by the far left, D.C. local politicians handcuffs the courts and empowers convicted criminals to get back out on the streets in record time.

Not only is this legislation misguided, but it comes at the height of a crime wave currently ravaging Capitol Hill.

Over the last year, our Nation's Capital has seen a 76 percent increase in carjackings, a 17 percent increase in homicides and a 117 percent uptick in sexual assaults.

To fight this scourge, we need to be taking a harder line on criminals, not coddling them like this justice reform package would do.

When the RCCA came before the House of Representatives for congressional review, House Republicans stood united in our opposition to this proposal. I am glad 31 of our Democratic colleagues did the right thing for the people of Washington, D.C., and crossed the aisle to stand with the Republican Conference in opposing the bill.

Now it appears a bipartisan group from the Senate will be joining myself and our House colleagues to defeat the RCCA, with President Biden also poised to lend his support.

Safeguarding our streets should never be a partisan issue, and common sense must always remain at the forefront of legislators' minds. I am glad such common sense seems to be winning the day in this case.

During my career as an NYPD detective, I served alongside law enforcement professionals of differing political persuasions, religions, and cultural backgrounds. Let me remind everyone that when people call 911, we never ask what political party they are from. What united us as cops was our commitment to serving the people and protecting the public from criminals.

Now, as a Member of Congress, I will continue that service by combating

far-left attacks on our criminal justice system and forcefully reject radical legislation much like the RCCA and the criminal justice reform put in place by Democrats in my home State of New York.

I will always advocate for safe streets and prosperous communities. That is my pledge to you, and that is our House Republican commitment to America.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his service as a police officer, law enforcement, and also now in Congress. We are delighted to have you.

Mr. Speaker, I yield next to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. JOHNSON for leading these opportunities for us to communicate with the American people openly and freely in a more casual, unhurried way of doing so.

It is good to be able to talk about these issues. Hopefully, folks are paying attention. We are just trying to get the truth out and call out the issues that are extremely important to them that we are working on in Congress.

When I get up here, a lot of times I am talking about our food supply and the farmers who grow it—as a Californian, we grow a lot of different crops—the water it takes to grow those crops, our energy, the condition of our energy in this country.

Tonight, I will talk more about our fiscal condition in this Nation and of this government. It is troubling because a recent report issued by the Congressional Budget Office found that the net interest of our national debt—Mr. JOHNSON was talking about that a little bit ago on spending—just the interest payment on our national debt will amount to a \$10.5 trillion burden for our taxpayers over the next decade.

We talk in these 10-year numbers. If you average that out, that is \$1.05 trillion per year just in interest service. For comparison, those interest costs over the previous decade amounted to only \$3 trillion, again, versus \$10.5 trillion for the coming decade. That is crushing on our national budget and crushing on the discretionary portion that we have over that budget.

That is not to take away from the fact that the Federal Government already is taxing and extracts more in taxes from American families than at any point in history.

This kind of payment on interest will devour a lot of our budget if we don't get a handle on this. I shudder to think if interest rates go up much more, the service on that debt becomes that much more extensive. Of course, Federal spending coupled with that is rising at an even higher rate. The increased spending has pushed our national debt over that magic \$31 trillion number, again, that we were speaking about.

As high as this is, it pales in comparison to the United States' unfunded liabilities, which amount to about \$182

trillion. Unfunded liabilities, meaning the debt obligations that do not have sufficient funds set aside to pay them, include Social Security, Medicare, Federal debt held by the public, and Federal employee and veteran benefits. Social Security and Medicare's liabilities add up to \$57 trillion. These numbers clearly show the United States Federal Government is living beyond its means.

Social Security and Medicare are called entitlement programs. Let me stop on that for a moment.

Sometimes that word "entitlement" is thought of as a dirty word, right?

It gets used pretty freely around here.

However, when you are talking about the entitlement as applied to Social Security and Medicare, it is not necessarily a dirty word because the people that paid into them are entitled to draw out from them. That is not a bad word in that sense. They are entitled to what they paid in and the amount that it grew during the time, hopefully, while it was being held for them more or less in trust by the Federal Government.

The CBO, Congressional Budget Office, predicts that Social Security will run out of money in 2033 and Medicare in 2026. The fund will be depleted.

We need to have an honest conversation about these funds, about these programs going forward. No one wants to take away Social Security. Nobody wants to deplete Medicare, but if they are going to be on the rocks in the year 2033 for Social Security, for example, then we better be doing something now. There needs to be an honest, bipartisan discussion about doing so.

What are we going to do to head that off and have the numbers not crunch badly by the time that time comes?

□ 1900

There are ways we can do that, but it is going to take an honest bipartisan discussion, not scaring people saying, oh, Republicans are going to take away Social Security. The President stood right up there and tried to claim that until he had to walk it back just a few weeks ago. There needs to be an honest discussion, not one used as a talking point or a political weapon.

What we have is 47 million retirees in America today, and 40 percent of the 47 million live entirely off Social Security. For these Americans, their benefits being reduced in the future could be disastrous. That is why we have to figure out how to make the fund go beyond 2033 and be sustainable, well, permanently.

If we are going to save these programs for the current and future generations, Congress must act swiftly, honestly with a real debate and set these finances in order and return to the fiscal responsibility that we should have had all along.

As stewards of the public's dollars, it is important that Congress spend the public's money wisely and respectfully. The House must use its powers to allocate government funds in a reasonable,

responsible way. There is a lot of room for debate on how that is, but if we are having an interaction, instead of hurrying through or doing a last minute patch-up at the end of the fiscal year, it is going to be a lot better in the light of day doing so.

The current D.C. model of taxing, borrowing, and spending money that we don't have will saddle our grandchildren with the burden of paying off today's debts. We don't even have to wait for our grandchildren. It is our children. It is us that are still in the work world. We are stuck with this. We have to do better.

Failure to fix Washington, D.C.'s, spending today will mean our children will have to live at lesser standards. We have always aspired that our children should always do a little better than us, to leave something a little better off. Why should they have to live under a worse standard only because we are spending like crazy? They will be saddled with a higher debt, higher taxes, and less opportunity.

America's strength on the world's stage depends on a strong American economy at home. We must get to getting it actually balanced and not take so long to truly balance our budget. It is our responsibility.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that wise counsel. It is about responsibility, and the gentleman said it so well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF).

Mr. KUSTOFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for organizing this evening's Special Order. The gentleman is a brilliant orator and brilliant lawyer, and I am proud to serve with him.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to speak about one of the biggest challenges facing our country today, and that is our national debt. We have heard about it tonight.

Our national debt today stands at over \$31 trillion. It is really hard to comprehend a number that large even for us who serve in the House of Representatives.

Instead of taking advantage of the record tax revenues that were produced from the Republican-passed Tax Cuts and Jobs Act in 2017, Democrats have used the 2 prior years that they had in power when they had the White House, the Senate, and the House of Representatives to spend an unprecedented amount of taxpayer dollars.

Here are two big democratic initiatives: Almost \$2 trillion spent on the American Rescue Plan; almost \$750 billion spent on what they call the Inflation Reduction Act, really the inflation expansion act.

Here is the bottom line: The result of the massive and colossal spending over those past 2 years has produced skyrocketing debt and rampant and raging inflation. We all hear about that inflation each and every day, just the fact that Americans have a tough time affording to live and exist today.

Right now, our country is on track to add almost \$20 trillion to the national debt over the next decade. We have heard these numbers quite a bit tonight. I don't think the American people can hear it enough.

By 2053, that number will reach almost 153 to \$154 trillion; trillion with a t. The interest costs on our national debt will amount to almost \$10.5 trillion for taxpayers over the next decade.

Now, again, to put that in perspective, the net interest cost over the previous 10 years was a little over \$3 trillion. Almost a month ago, our government officially hit its debt limit, and the Treasury Department is now using extraordinary measures to postpone a default.

Every household, every business, frankly, everybody, must balance their budget in order to survive. The Federal Government should be no exception.

The bottom line is something has got to change because Americans are getting crushed under the weight of President Biden's failed economic policies.

The good news is that House Republicans are committed to turning this around for American families, for American businesses, for the American people.

Just this week, I traveled to Yukon, Oklahoma, with my colleagues on the House Ways and Means Committee to hear about the economic and regulatory challenges that they face each and every day. It is the second field hearing that the committee has held since taking back the House of Representatives.

In February, we traveled to West Virginia to hear from people in Appalachia. Republicans on the House Committee on Ways and Means are determined to hear directly from taxpayers, from businessowners, from farmers, from manufacturers, from energy producers about how we can ensure that we can get past all the hardships and all the hurdles. We want to ensure that everyone can succeed. The message that we have heard as a committee from the American people has been very clear: Americans have had enough.

In our commitment to America, House Republicans promise to work toward creating an economy that is strong. One of the most effective ways that we can do that is to reign in the out-of-control spending and get our government's fiscal house in order. We have got to find sensible, reasonable, and responsible solutions to addressing our Nation's economic and debt crisis.

As it stands now, we are leaving our children, our grandchildren, and the next generation with the bill and forcing them to live with potentially higher taxes and less opportunities unless we can do something and do something now.

From all of us on this side of the aisle, we want to make sure that Congress can come together, that we get our country's finances in order so that the promise of the American Dream

stays intact for families in my home State of Tennessee, in my district, and certainly across the Nation.

We can do it. We have got to work hard. We have got to reign in this out-of-control spending.

I thank you, Congressman JOHNSON, for organizing tonight's Special Order so we can speak directly to the American people about this crucial issue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks; that was so well said. The gentleman is a great orator, and I love how he laid out the case methodically. That is what a former U.S. attorney from the Western District of Tennessee would do.

Facts are stubborn things, as John Adams said.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE), another brilliant lawyer and also my good friend.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding me the time. It is true, the wasteful spending, the tax hikes, and the excessive regulations of the Biden administration are crushing working families and small businesses across this country.

In particular, I rise tonight in support of the House Joint Resolution to denounce Biden's overly ambitious rule proposed for changing the definition of the waters of the United States, also known as WOTUS.

You know, agriculture is the number one industry in Virginia, and the Sixth District is proud to be home to more than 8,000 farms.

Narrowly defined water regulation is key to ensure that Virginia's agriculture industry can succeed and local industries can thrive. Unfortunately, the disastrous EPA is working to regulate every pond and every puddle, every stream and small creek with their new WOTUS regulation.

This new rule is going to negatively impact the vital goods and services that farmers, ranchers, and small businesses provide to the Commonwealth and across the Nation.

I have heard from farmers and property owners up and down my district. One thing is clear: They do not want to be told how to use and regulate their land by Joe Biden's radical EPA.

Imposing this overly broad and burdensome regulation will grant Biden's bureaucrats more arbitrary control over our rural communities, saddling folks with costly red tape.

It is far past time that we rescind the administration's new WOTUS ruling and protect America's farmers from this gross overreach of government power.

I thank the gentleman again for organizing this evening's Special Order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. The regulatory environment is just out of control, and that recent Supreme Court opinion of *West Virginia v. EPA* came out on our side, and I think that some of these agencies will



begin to have their wings clipped a bit, and hopefully this WOTUS rule will be handled appropriately. I thank the gentleman for highlighting that important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRECHEEN), one of the new stars of the Republican Party in the Congress, a former State senator there who now represents the Second District representing his people very well.

Mr. BRECHEEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't stand for a more important topic. This is what I believe is the greatest domestic threat that is facing this country. Our national debt in our last 40 years of inheriting prosperity from our parents and grandparents, and in the last many years we have been borrowing and stealing prosperity from our children and grandchildren because of an insatiable appetite for spending other people's money, which is the easiest thing to do in a manner that is not in line with our revenue.

There is a Founding Father who gave us a great warning. Thomas Jefferson told us, he said you should not allow your leaders to load you with perpetual debt. It is the same Thomas Jefferson who years later would make the comment which he defined in Latin terms as the "abusive state of man." He said: "... the fore-horse of this frightful team is public debt. Taxation follows that, and in its train wretchedness and oppression."

Our liberty as a Nation is in jeopardy. We hear trillions of dollars that are, you know, tossed around, and I don't think we really understand the size and scope of a trillion dollars. If I stood on this floor and at a second at a time I laid a dollar bill on this podium and I didn't stop to eat or sleep, taking a second at a time to lay out that dollar bill, it would take me 11 days—you would get tired sitting in that chair, Mr. Speaker—11 days watching me count out a million dollars.

If I was to lay out a dollar at a time on this table a second at a time, the time to lay it out and retrieve my hand, it would take me 31 years to lay out a billion dollars if I didn't stop to eat or sleep.

In order to get to a trillion dollars, it would take me 31,000 years, 31,000 years if I didn't stop to eat or sleep a second at a time.

We know what has happened in 2022: 40-year high record of inflation. The average Oklahoman spent \$7,000 more than they did the year prior to buy the exact same goods and services because of devaluation of the dollar.

That is the tip of the iceberg. That is what we see. That is what people are feeling. What is under the water that we can't see is this collision course that we are headed toward, this gigantic iceberg of the mountain of debt in our unfunded obligations.

Our national debt at \$31.5 trillion, every man, woman, and newborn child,

if you take that number and you divide it, every baby, including babies that open their eyes today and take in their first breath of air, owe \$94,000 just to pay off that \$31.5 trillion. They will pay it off through a lower standard of living. It is a hidden tax that we are going pass on to our kids because of our selfishness.

\$1.4 trillion has been a number that has kind of been in my head for the last few days.

□ 1915

The CBO number, the Congressional Budget Office number, said that this year's deficit is \$1.4 trillion. We will overspend \$1.4 trillion this year.

If you go back 40 years ago to 1983, that is exactly the size of our gross national debt in 1983. It was \$1.4 trillion. It took us 200 years as a nation to get to \$1.4 trillion. This year, we will overspend in 1 year that amount.

CBO is also giving us projections about where our interest rates are taking us. Within 7 years, what we spend that will be flushed down the toilet just in interest payments is going to match what we spend on the entire defense of our country.

If you take that interest rate out to 10 years from now, it is also \$1.4 trillion. There is the number yet again.

In 1983, after 200 years, the size of our gross national debt was \$1.4 trillion. This year, we will overspend by that amount, our annual deficit.

Ten years from now, that will be just the interest that will be flushed down the toilet, the annual debt service payments 10 years from now.

That is a 50-year spread of \$1.4 trillion. We are in trouble.

Our current gross national debt-to-GDP ratio is 129 percent. There are only 11 other countries in the world that have a higher debt-to-GDP ratio than we do, and these are the small countries, the small countries that aren't a world leader, a shining city on a hill.

Economists are predicting that Medicare will be insolvent in 2028. They actually bumped the number to 2028. We are only going to be able to pay out to 90 percent. There will be an automatic 10 percent cut in 2028 to Medicare if we do nothing.

In 2033, the actuaries are telling us Social Security becomes insolvent. There will be an automatic 25 percent cut to Social Security. Without anyone changing anything, that is what we face.

When you add the liabilities, the unfunded liabilities of Medicare, Social Security, what we owe veterans for pensions, Federal employees for pensions, other trust programs we have stolen out of over the last many years, and you add in addition our \$31 trillion, our sum total is \$120 trillion of unfunded liabilities debt. That came out last year with very little fanfare. Only the Heartland Institute picked it up.

That \$120 trillion total, they said if you put it against all assets in Amer-

ica, if you assessed it against the valuation of all property, all land, all homes, all stocks, and—they even said this—down to pieces of furniture, it is 86 percent of all wealth in America right now.

You will remember I talked through how long it would take to get to a trillion dollars. It would take you 31,000 years if you counted out a dollar at a time. It would take you 3.7 million years to get to \$120 trillion if you didn't stop to eat or sleep and you counted out a dollar at a time.

According to the U.S. Treasury Department in its February 2022 report that I just cited, in order for us to pay this all back, another way of looking at it, if every household would just send a million-dollar check to your Federal Government, that will make us square with the house as a nation.

Thomas Jefferson wasn't alone. Benjamin Franklin warned us, if we can gather it from his conversation with Elizabeth Powel when this Constitution was put together. When he was asked outside by Elizabeth Powel, as one of the leading members of Philadelphia society, after weeks of putting this Constitution together, she said: What have you given us, a republic or a monarch?

His response was: We have given you a republic if you can keep it.

That is important because Article IV, Section 4, of our U.S. Constitution guarantees to every State a republican form of government and to protect them from invasion.

We will stay on the republican conversation, the republic form, for a moment. Why is a republic important? Our Founders in that study, in the Constitutional Convention, they looked at all forms of government. They spent weeks. A republic was different—they knew it—than a democracy. Benjamin Franklin also described democracy. He said it is two wolves and a lamb voting on what they are going to have for lunch, but liberty is a well-armed lamb contesting the vote.

What we are talking about is the liberty of this country. We are trading our liberty for debt and dependency. Liberty means something.

In the constitutional preamble, it says: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." It is a mission statement. We have a duty to live up to the mission statement that was handed to us 200 years ago, and we are missing the mark.

May God help us obtain the courage to put our national interests ahead of our own personal self-interests and squarely face these problems that are addressing the American people.

I will end by saying this: Martin Luther King, Jr., had a statement that my old boss, Tom Coburn, kind of tweaked, and he shortened it. It is this:

Cowardice asks the question, is it safe? Vanity asks the question, is it popular? But conscience asks the question, is it right?

It is right to secure the blessings of liberty, not just for ourselves but our posterity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is a harsh truth, and we have to address it. My colleague is right. As he implied there, the inevitable result of living beyond our means today is that we and our children inevitably are going to have to live below our means tomorrow.

We are going to have higher debt, higher taxes, less security, less opportunity. It is not going to be the same America that we have always known and valued. It is a harsh truth.

Mr. Speaker, I yield next to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my good friend.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I know normally this hour is taken up with speeches that I think are not bipartisan enough. I have decided to take this time to congratulate President Biden on his decision not to veto the bill we are sending over to him, which will prevent the District of Columbia from decreasing the penalties for severe crimes committed in this city.

I think what President Biden has done is finally recognized what a lot of us have been saying over the last few years. The District of Columbia is just plainly and simply not capable of self-governance at this time. I am glad President Biden agrees with us on that topic.

Right now, the District of Columbia has the second-highest spending per capita in the country on its schools, trailing only New York. Nevertheless, its test scores are abysmal.

The over 200 murders last year in the Nation's Capital is also an embarrassment, and that number has skyrocketed this year so far as of mid-February.

I will tell you, this is the Nation's Capital. There is no city we should care about more than the District of Columbia. It should be a shining light to represent the United States. People come here from all around the world.

I remember once I took a trip to Taipei, the large capital city of Taiwan. I was there with some friends. I asked our tour guide if there was anywhere at night we should not go, expecting there were some places we could not walk to without danger. We were told there was nowhere in Taipei we can't go. Nowhere in Taipei is not safe.

I was kind of embarrassed about my country because I thought, well, I was safe going to Taipei, but if I had visitors coming from Taiwan to Washington, D.C., I would be talking for quite a while, explaining all the places we couldn't go here.

I don't know whether people are aware that Vladimir Putin makes fun of our country for allowing such decline in the District of Columbia, not only how embarrassingly high our

crime rate is but how embarrassingly low our test scores in the schools are, how embarrassing it is to have so many homeless people wherever you look.

I hope President Biden builds on this new conversion in which he is admitting the District of Columbia is not capable, apparently, of setting appropriate punishments for crimes here.

I look forward to working with President Biden on perhaps things we can do to improve the decisions by the local school board on their schools, maybe make some changes in their welfare policies that lead to so many homeless people here.

In any event, like I said, I would like to end tonight's speeches on an upbeat message, thanking President Biden for his conversion to the understanding that the people here in the District of Columbia, who, by the way, he is not a perfect man, but they voted 6 percent for Donald Trump in the last election. I kind of wondered what type of people would do that, but they did.

In any event, hopefully, President Biden will be happy to meet with us and think of other things we can do to improve life in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I point out, as he said, that our resolution blocking those crazy changes to D.C.'s criminal code was so strong that even Joe Biden couldn't agree to veto it. We are doing the right thing. We must continue, and we will.

I am grateful to my Republican colleagues for joining me for this Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 9, 2023, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STEIL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 197. Resolution providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Eighteenth Congress; with an amendment (Rept. 118-8). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. LUNA (for herself, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr.

MOYLAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FRY, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. MACE, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mrs. McCLAIN, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 1434. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require a member of the Armed Forces serving on active duty to receive self defense training once a month to combat sexual assault; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. LATTI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. EMMER, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. ROY, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. MAST, Mr. PENCE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. GUEST, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BOST, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GRIF-FITH, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mrs. BICE, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HERN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. MANN, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. CAREY):

H.R. 1435. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prevent the elimination of the sale of internal combustion engines; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. BROWN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1436. A bill to provide additional funding for scholarships for students at 1890 institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROSE (for himself and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 1437. A bill to authorize livestock producers and their employees to take black vultures in order to prevent death, injury, or destruction to livestock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 1438. A bill to require certain non-profit and not-for-profit social welfare organizations to submit disclosure reports on foreign funding to the Attorney General; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CASE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. TAKANO, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 1439. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to allow all eligible voters to vote by mail in Federal elections, to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for automatic voter registration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 1440. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on heavy trucks and trailers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 1441. A bill to require the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement to further develop, finalize, and implement updated regulations for offshore oil and gas pipelines to address long-standing limitations regarding its ability to ensure active pipeline integrity and address safety and environmental risks associated with decommissioning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARL:

H.R. 1442. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the forfeiture of certain Federal retirement benefits for Federal employees convicted of making false statements before Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. FROST, Mr. MCCORMICK, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 1443. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit oil and gas preleasing, leasing, and related activities in certain areas of the Outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. BROWN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. TOKUDA):

H.R. 1444. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide for the consideration of climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1445. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to annually report on aviation consumer complaints related to passengers with a disability; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 1446. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to expand foster parent training and authorize new appropriations to support the obtaining of a driver's license; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELUZIO (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. TITUS, Ms. WILD, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MULLIN, and Ms. BARRAGÁN):

H.R. 1447. A bill to prohibit an employer from terminating the coverage of an employee under a group health plan while the employer is engaged in a lock-out or while the employee is engaged in a lawful strike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana):

H.R. 1448. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to prohibit investment by foreign adversaries in United States real estate suitable for renewable energy or renew-

able fuels production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FULCHER:

H.R. 1449. A bill to amend the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 to increase the frequency of lease sales, to require replacement sales, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FULCHER (for himself, Ms. PEREZ, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 1450. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to modify the treatment of revenue from timber sale contracts and certain payments made by counties to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior under good neighbor agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLEGO (for himself and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 1451. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the enlistment of certain aliens in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1452. A bill to amend the Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 to direct the Commandant of the Coast Guard to provide certain data related to water quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GARBARINO (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BACON, and Mrs. MCBATH):

H.R. 1453. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code, to allow full subrogation, including subrogation to the priority rights of the United States, of claims for the payment of customs duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN (for herself and Ms. TOKUDA):

H.R. 1454. A bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to establish a cacao tree health initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN (for herself and Ms. TOKUDA):

H.R. 1455. A bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to provide research and extension grants to support the study of insects and pests that impact plantains and bananas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 1456. A bill to limit the use of funds for the production of films using assets of the Department of State under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 1457. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to take certain actions with re-

spect to certain qualified coal applications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HERN (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 1458. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of prescription digital therapeutics under such titles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HINSON (for herself, Mr. PARNETTA, Mr. FINSTAD, and Ms. CRAIG):

H.R. 1459. A bill to leverage incentives for the adoption of precision agriculture technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 1460. A bill to require an interagency study on the environmental and energy impacts of crypto-asset mining, to assess crypto-asset mining compliance with the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mrs. PELTOLA):

H.R. 1461. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out a study on coastal seaweed farming, issue regulation relating to such farming, and establish an Indigenous seaweed farming fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. STEEL, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. RYAN, and Mrs. FITSCHBACH):

H.R. 1462. A bill to require enforcement against misbranded milk alternatives; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KIM of New Jersey:

H.R. 1463. A bill to prohibit Federal officials from owning covered investments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Agriculture, Oversight and Accountability, House Administration, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LESKO (for herself, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. CISCOMANI):

H.R. 1464. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify that the Secretary of Homeland Security may waive certain environmental requirements to permit U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to search for unlawful border crossing tunnels on private land to prevent the illegal entry of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MACE (for herself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. CASTEN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. LIEU, Mr. MAST, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POSEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 1465. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to allow for the adoption or non-laboratory placement of certain animals used in Federal research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MCCLAIN (for herself, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOST, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 1466. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit research with human fetal tissue obtained pursuant to an abortion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 1467. A bill to adjust the amount of monthly old-age, survivors, and disability insurance payments under title II of the Social Security Act based on locality-based comparability payment rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Ms. CHU, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. OMAR, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. TOKUDA, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 1468. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and improve the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORMAN (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 1469. A bill to prohibit a mask mandate to prevent the spread of COVID-19 on a military installation in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NORMAN (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HERN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. OGLES, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 1470. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for abortion through financial or logistical support to individuals traveling to another State or country to receive an abortion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. OMAR (for herself, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ):

H.R. 1471. A bill to provide for the imposition of sanctions with respect to foreign countries that are in violation of international human rights law or international

humanitarian law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself and Mr. BAIRD):

H.R. 1472. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to provide for a consistent definition for plant biostimulants; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 1473. A bill to provide for a program within the Forest Service to detect, document, monitor, and remediate the environmental damages caused by trespass cultivation on National Forest Lands, and amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to include criminal penalties for illegal pesticide application on Government property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama:

H.R. 1474. A bill to allow States to elect to observe year-round daylight saving time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMUCKER (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina):

H.R. 1475. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop and nationally disseminate accurate, relevant, and accessible resources to promote understanding about sensitivities regarding adoption in the health care industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TIMMONS:

H.R. 1476. A bill to provide for the collection and sharing of information, including tax return information, for purposes of criminal investigations with respect to loans under the Paycheck Protection Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H.R. 1477. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit certain expenses associated with obtaining or maintaining recognized postsecondary credentials to be treated as qualified higher education expenses for purposes of 529 accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEHLS (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. OGLES, and Mr. JACKSON of Texas):

H.J. Res. 41. A joint resolution disapproving of the rule submitted by the Department of Homeland Security relating to "Public Charge Ground of Inadmissibility"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H. Res. 205. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives and ranking a Member on a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. LEE of Florida (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida):

H. Res. 206. A resolution expressing support for the 88th Florida Strawberry Festival in

Plant City, Florida, its cultural significance to the State of Florida, and the contributions of Plant City's strawberry industry to American agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LUTTRELL (for himself, Mr. HERN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, and Mr. ELLZEY):

H. Res. 207. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit Members, officers, and employees of the House from serving on the board of directors of any entity which receives funding from, or is affiliated with or owned or controlled by, the United Front Work Department of the Chinese Communist Party, any other element of the Chinese Communist Party, or any foreign adversary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARSON:

H. Res. 208. A resolution observing the 100th anniversary of the birth of John Leslie "Wes" Montgomery and commemorating his contributions to jazz music; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. TOKUDA, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H. Res. 209. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the importance of taking a feminist approach to all aspects of foreign policy, including foreign assistance and humanitarian response, trade, diplomacy, defense, immigration, funding, and accountability mechanisms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H. Res. 210. A resolution supporting the designation of December 5 of each year as "National Soil Health Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself, Mr. CROW, Ms. PETERSEN, Ms. CARAVEO, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H. Res. 211. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 8, 2023, as "National Emily Warner and Women Airline Pilots Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. NICKEL (for himself, Mr. SORENSON, and Ms. PETERSEN):

H. Res. 212. A resolution opposing a national sales tax on working families and supporting a tax cut to benefit the middle class; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Armed Services, Veterans' Affairs, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H. Res. 213. A resolution supporting the designation of March 2023 as National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

# CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. Trone:

H.R. 1428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To repeal Section 297B(e)(3)(B) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1639p(e)(3)(B)) and eliminate the 10-year drug felony prohibition for hemp farmers.

By Mrs. LUNA:

H.R. 1434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 cl. 14

The single subject of this legislation is:

Self defense/combat training for active duty service members

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to “regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Clean Air Act to prevent the elimination of the sale or use of internal combustion engines.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 1436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The commerce clause power under article 1, section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Funding for 1890s institutions.

By Mr. ROSE:

H.R. 1437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To authorize livestock producers and their employees to take black vultures in order to prevent death, injury, or destruction to livestock.

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 1438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18, necessary and proper

The single subject of this legislation is:

Foreign Government Accountability

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation expands access to the right to vote.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 1440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution: “The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

To repeal the Federal excise tax on heavy trucks and trailers.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 1441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Offshore pipelines

By Mr. CARL:

H.R. 1442.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill would strip federal employees of their pension benefits if they are convicted of lying to Congress about their official duties while employed.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 1443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution provides Congress with the authority to “provide for the common Defense and general Welfare” of Americans.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit oil and gas preleasing, leasing, and related activities in certain areas of the Outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Florida

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 1444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The subject of this bill is Superfund sites.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Aviation

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Child Welfare

By Mr. DELUZIO:

H.R. 1447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Labor

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 1448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 4 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit investment by foreign adversaries in United States real estate suitable for renewable energy or renewable fuels production.

By Mr. FULCHER:

H.R. 1449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, providing Congress to “make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution” the power enumerated in Article 1 and “all other Powers vested by [the] Constitution of the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

Related to increase of geothermal leases on Federal lands and consideration of geothermal drilling permits timetables.

By Mr. FULCHER:

H.R. 1450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, providing Congress to “make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution” the power enumerated in Article 1 and “all other Powers vested by [the] Constitution of the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

Related to Good Neighbor Authority to provide shared receipts for entities like counties and Tribes through the authority.

By Mr. GALLEGOS:

H.R. 1451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: “[The Congress shall have the power. . .] To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

Armed Services

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8, Article I of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 to direct the Commandant of the Coast Guard to provide certain data related to water quality, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GARBARINO:

H.R. 1453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title 11 of the United States Code, to allow full subrogation, including subrogation to the priority rights of the United States, of claims for the payment of customs duties.

By Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN:

H.R. 1454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 18, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

Congress shall have the power . . . “To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution of the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill amends the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to establish a cacao tree health initiative, and for other purposes.

By Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN:

H.R. 1455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 18, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

Congress shall have the power. . . “To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution of the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill amends the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to provide research and extension grants to support the study of insects and pests that impact plantains and bananas, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 1456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Restricts the use of Department of State assets or technical assistance for U.S. film production entities if they engage in content censorship at the behest of the Chinese Communist Party.

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 1457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Requires Secretary of Interior to take certain actions with respect to certain qualified coal applications

By Mr. HERN:

H.R. 1458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Medicare

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 1459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend Sections 304 and 310 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act and Sections 1201, 1240, and 1242 of the Food Security Act of 1985 to utilize existing programs at the U.S. Department of Agriculture to help producers obtain precision agriculture technology.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 1460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Cryptocurrency

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 1461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out a study on coastal seaweed farming, issue regulation relating to such farming, and establish an Indigenous seaweed farming fund, and for other purposes.

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require enforcement against misbranded milk alternatives.

By Mr. KIM of New Jersey:

H.R. 1463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Stock Trading

By Mrs. LESKO:

H.R. 1464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Border Security

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 1465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Would require all federal agencies to enact policies allowing for the retirement of surviving lab animals no longer needed in taxpayer-funded experimentation.

By Mrs. McCLAIN:

H.R. 1466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit research with human fetal tissue obtained pursuant to an abortion, and for other purposes

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 1467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution [page H10170]

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Social Security Administration to increase an individual's monthly Social Security benefit amount in accordance with the locality-based comparability payment rate applicable to the federal locality-pay area in which the individual resides.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

H.R. 1468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Federal taxation

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 1469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit the Secretary of Defense from imposing any federal mask mandate policies pertaining to COVID-19 on military installations located in the United States.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 1470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit the use of Federal funds for abortion through financial or logistical support to individuals traveling to another State or country to receive an abortion.

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 1471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To restrict security assistance and arms sales with respect to foreign countries that are in violation of international law.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 1472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 18

The single subject of this bill is:

agriculture.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 1473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Public lands

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama:

H.R. 1474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Daylight Savings Time

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 1475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the U.S. Constitution (the Spending Clause)

The single subject of this legislation is:

To establish a grant program to fund adoption education for hospitals and establish a committee of adoption experts to disseminate nationally best practices in adoption sensitivity procedures.

By Mr. TIMMONS:

H.R. 1476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

A Bill to identify and report fraudulent PPP Recipients.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 1477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Eligible expenses of 529 savings accounts

By Mr. NEHLS:

H.J. Res. 41.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The Resolution of Disapproval would prevent the rule submitted by the Department of Homeland Security relating to “Public Charge Ground of Inadmissibility” (87 Fed. Reg. 5547; published September 9, 2022), from having any force or effect.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. MOLINARO, Mr. BABIN, Mr. SANTOS, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 53: Mrs. LUNA.

H.R. 82: Mrs. FLETCHER and Mr. LUTTRELL.

H.R. 223: Mrs. LUNA.

H.R. 231: Mr. SELF.



- H.R. 314: Ms. LEE of Florida.  
 H.R. 330: Mrs. LUNA.  
 H.R. 343: Mrs. LUNA and Mr. CALVERT.  
 H.R. 371: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.  
 H.R. 372: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.  
 H.R. 383: Mrs. LUNA.  
 H.R. 491: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.  
 H.R. 516: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.  
 H.R. 524: Ms. MACE.  
 H.R. 525: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.  
 H.R. 537: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.  
 H.R. 564: Mr. CRAWFORD.  
 H.R. 568: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.  
 H.R. 574: Mr. GOODEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 589: Ms. DELBENE.  
 H.R. 645: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.  
 H.R. 661: Mr. LOUDERMILK.  
 H.R. 662: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.  
 H.R. 698: Mr. SORESENSEN.  
 H.R. 700: Mr. ESTES.  
 H.R. 734: Mrs. LESKO, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.  
 H.R. 735: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. STEIL.  
 H.R. 736: Mrs. McCLAIN and Mr. ALLEN.  
 H.R. 750: Mr. ALLEN.  
 H.R. 758: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. ROSE.  
 H.R. 767: Ms. BARRAGÁN.  
 H.R. 801: Mrs. LUNA, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. GROTHMAN.  
 H.R. 807: Mr. OWENS and Mr. MANN.  
 H.R. 813: Ms. ESHOO.  
 H.R. 830: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. NEGUSE.  
 H.R. 856: Mr. GOMEZ.  
 H.R. 871: Ms. DELBENE.  
 H.R. 911: Mrs. FLETCHER and Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H.R. 915: Mr. BOST.  
 H.R. 916: Mr. MOYLAN.  
 H.R. 953: Ms. BALINT and Ms. DEGETTE.  
 H.R. 965: Ms. SALAZAR.  
 H.R. 1006: Mr. LAMALFA.  
 H.R. 1007: Mr. LAMALFA.  
 H.R. 1009: Mr. LAMALFA.  
 H.R. 1023: Mr. BUCHSHON and Mr. CURTIS.  
 H.R. 1047: Ms. CHU.  
 H.R. 1068: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. CURTIS.  
 H.R. 1070: Mr. ALLEN.  
 H.R. 1074: Mr. LATTI.  
 H.R. 1077: Ms. NORTON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BROWN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. NADLER, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CARSON, and Ms. LEE of California.  
 H.R. 1088: Mrs. FOUSHEE.  
 H.R. 1140: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
 H.R. 1141: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. WALBERG.  
 H.R. 1143: Mr. LATTI.  
 H.R. 1145: Mr. KILDEE.  
 H.R. 1154: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 1158: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. BUCHSHON.  
 H.R. 1199: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.  
 H.R. 1202: Mr. VAN DREW and Mr. DOGGETT.  
 H.R. 1218: Mr. STEUBE.  
 H.R. 1220: Mr. OGLES.  
 H.R. 1228: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H.R. 1231: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.  
 H.R. 1233: Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CHU, and Mr. CORREA.  
 H.R. 1238: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CASAR, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. TITUS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SORESENSEN, Ms. PETTERSEN, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
 H.R. 1250: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.  
 H.R. 1255: Ms. WILD, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE.  
 H.R. 1267: Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. KILDEE.  
 H.R. 1292: Mr. COLE.  
 H.R. 1293: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois and Mr. NEGUSE.  
 H.R. 1297: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H.R. 1310: Mr. VASQUEZ.  
 H.R. 1318: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER.  
 H.R. 1324: Mr. STEUBE, Mr. ELLZEY, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Ms. SHERRILL.  
 H.R. 1327: Mrs. FOUSHEE.  
 H.R. 1348: Ms. SALAZAR.  
 H.R. 1362: Mr. JACKSON of Texas.  
 H.R. 1378: Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK.  
 H.R. 1382: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BABIN, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. ESTES, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. CLYDE.  
 H.R. 1383: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 1387: Ms. LEE of California and Ms. WILD.  
 H.R. 1396: Mr. COSTA, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. HUFFMAN.  
 H.R. 1399: Mr. POSEY, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. CLYDE.  
 H.R. 1425: Mr. GROTHMAN and Ms. HAGEMAN.  
 H.J. Res. 11: Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. DUARTE, and Mr. TIFFANY.  
 H.J. Res. 25: Mr. RYAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SORESENSEN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CASAR, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. FROST, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. CORREA, Ms. CARAVEO, Mrs. RAMIREZ, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
 H.J. Res. 31: Mr. LOUDERMILK.  
 H. Con. Res. 14: Mr. ALLEN.  
 H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. PALMER, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. BUCHSHON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mrs. LESKO.  
 H. Res. 7: Mrs. LUNA.  
 H. Res. 108: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. SCANLON.  
 H. Res. 115: Mrs. LUNA.  
 H. Res. 124: Mr. LAMALFA.  
 H. Res. 170: Mr. LAWLER.  
 H. Res. 173: Mr. CASE.  
 H. Res. 200: Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania.  
 H. Res. 202: Mr. POSEY.